This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

Digitized by Google

Ger. 1419. e 1706
14

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

THE REVEALED FUTURE OF THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

VOLUME XIV.

BEING VOLUME IV. OF THE NEW SERIES.

LONDON:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C

1877.

Digitized by Google

LONDON:
PRINTED BY CHALONER AND COOKE,
OXFORD ARMS PASSAGE, E.C.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

A Few Words on Life in Christ 407
Abraham's Night Vision at Beersheba 453
A Grateful Retrospect 529
"Behold, I Make All Things New" 531
Correspondence . . 44, 91, 137, 237, 282, 331, 474, 569
Christian Kindness 152
Canon Liddon on Immortality . . . 289, 362, 392
Colonisation of Palestine 328
Constitution of Man 402
Cherubic Phenomena 417, 469, 502
Clemance (Rev. C.) on Future Punishment . . . 563
Death of the Body not the Extinction of the Soul . 131, 225, 276
Disturbed Thessalonians 337
Death the Entire Extinction of Life . . . 352, 445
Day of the Paradise 382
Destiny of the Earth and its Firmament . . . 384
Evangelisation in Hades 68
English Pulpit 193
Ecclesiastes 514
Family that Jesus Loved 244
Fragments 508
"Goodwill" of God to Men 129
Heathen World 535
Imprecatory Psalms 82, 262, 321, 409
Immovable Kingdom 481
Kingdom of the Son of Man 56
Literature . . 46, 95, 141, 191, 239, 287, 333, 384, 480, 574
Modern Unbelief 49, 145, 248
Man giveth up the Ghost, and where is he? . . . 87
Ministry of Evil 162
Man and his Failures 233
Nature and its Leaning 17
No Advance 72
Notices . . 47, 96, 144, 191, 287, 336, 480, 528, 575
Narrow Views and Broad Views 119
Notes on 2 Timothy iii. and iv. . . . 343, 436, 540
New Jerusalem 124
Poetry . . 43, 118, 172, 261, 298, 330, 361, 453, 494, 534

Digitized by Google

PAGE

Proxyism 22
Professor Huxley in America 41
Parabolic Trinity 77
Priesthood of Christ 168
Parable of the Ten Virgins 202
Paraphrased Prophecies 217, 267, 316
Probable Time of the Second Advent . . . 376, 421
Relative Order of the Millennium and Advent . . . 5
Royal Priesthood 97
Resurrection of the Dead . . 104, 220, 270, 366, 459, 547
Retribution 211
Rejection of Christ 347
Remarks on Hebrews xiii. 10 399
Side Issues 38
Suggestive Hints on the Eastern Question . . . 80
Song of Moses 196
Simon the Sorcerer 255
Spirits in Prison 299
Some Characteristics of our Lord's Teaching . . . 304
Speaking for the Future 433
Scripture Teaching Concerning the Wicked . . . 520
Thoughts on John xi. 1
Thoughts on Christian Work 61, 157, 312
The Throne and Witnesses 173
The Grecian Heresy 241
The Spirit of Man that is in him 326
"The Regeneration" 441
"Things which must shortly come to pass" . . . 489
Temporal Death not total Extinction . . . 510, 558
Typical and Allegorical Interpretations 568

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JANUARY, 1877.

THOUGHTS ON JOHN XI.

THIS chapter is in many respects a most interesting one. It brings before us, and as it were lets us see a little into, what may be called the *family life* of the better class of Jews in our Lord's time, and of his relations thereto. From the circumstance of Martha preparing a feast which evidently included a large number of guests, and from the fact that so many of the Jews are spoken of as coming to comfort Martha and Mary after the loss of their brother, we have every reason to believe that they were people of some distinction, perhaps corresponding to what we should call in the present day the upper middle class of society. They were, moreover, evidently pious, earnest, God-fearing people; and may, therefore, be taken as representatives of the better portion of the religious and educated Jews. It is impossible to suppose that our Lord would have loved as he did all the members of this family had they been otherwise than sincere and good people.

We have in fact in this family of Bethany a beautiful picture of domestic life in a religious and God-fearing Jewish family. I say "a picture" because here, as so often in the Gospels and indeed in the Scriptures generally, the writers thereof seem to have a marvellous power of presenting by a few bold, graphic touches, the *character* of the persons of whom they are writing, and this chapter will, I think, in the cases of Martha and Mary fully bear out my assertion.

There can be no doubt that the nearest approach to a heaven upon earth is to be found in the midst of a well-ordered, pious, loving family. What a vision of happiness is afforded thereby, and what consolation and comfort. What a haven of rest from the storms of this world is the bosom of a family where God is really worshipped. It almost seems as if the Creator here affords to us a proof of what he designed the world to be, by showing us

Digitized by Google

how much happiness may be attained when "brethren dwell together in unity."

I have been much struck with an observation of the late Henry Crabbe Robinson, in which he states that "Almost everything that is done by a family as such is good."

When a family are really united they present to the world a picture or image, faint indeed, but of the right kind, of what God wishes his children to be; for there we have, first, the cheerful love and obedience of the child to the parent, and then the mutual forbearance and affection of one towards the other. Indeed it is scarcely saying too much to observe that if all mankind manifested towards each other such love and kindness as is often shown by the different members of one family, the world even now would be almost a paradise. And that this is the will and intention of God there can be no doubt, from the beautiful language of the prophet Malachi: "Have we not all one Father, hath not God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?"

In the eleventh chapter of St. John's Gospel we have an instance of a united happy family, all of them more or less servants of Christ, and there is no reason to doubt that among them our Lord was often received, and his spirit refreshed and comforted. The statement in the fifth verse of this chapter, brief though it be, is sufficient proof that he was on most friendly terms with all the members of this family; and doubtless they found how great a blessing to them, and how full of spiritual comfort it was, to be permitted to draw so near to him. How natural it was, then, for these sisters at once to send to our Lord when the illness of Lazarus began to assume an alarming form. How confident they must have been that if he could only arrive in time all would be well. And how deeply they must have felt it when he from whom they had hoped so much failed to appear. How strange, not to say hard, must our Lord's behaviour have seemed to them.

Now I think we have here a most comforting and beautiful instance of the way in which God works. Here is the case of one whom Jesus loved being sick unto death, and yet when the sisters of Lazarus send notice of the fact to our Lord, so far from hastening to his friend's assistance as we should have expected, he remains —evidently on purpose—two days still in the place where he was. But the instant he knows that Lazarus is really dead, he at once sets out, in spite of all the machinations of his enemies, and of the risk which he knew he ran in going into Judæa.

We may be sure that it was a hard, a terrible trial to our Lord to force himself as it were to stop where he was when he knew that by going to Bethany he could save his friend. But he never hesitated when he saw what the Father's will was. That his heart was indeed thus full of pity and tenderness we know from the fact

Digitized by Google

that though perfectly aware that Lazarus would soon be restored to life, and the weeping eyes around him dried, yet the very sight of those tears was it would seem too much for him. How his very soul must have been torn by the few heart-broken, scarcely articulate words of Mary,—one of the best and most pious women on earth,—as half in despair, half almost in reproach, she fell at his feet and said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." As though she had said, "You would not come when we sent for you." Even the glorious event which he knew was to happen in a few minutes could not prevent him from being deeply moved.

Now if Christ be "the image of the invisible God," we have here a revelation of what our Father in heaven feels when he permits evil to take its course, in order that greater and more glorious good may ultimately result. Surely in all our afflictions he is afflicted, and partakes of all our sufferings.* Should not this alone constrain us never to grieve that Blessed Spirit who is now his representative on earth?

What an instructive instance again we have in this chapter, of the marvellous way in which our Lord adapts himself to the cases and circumstances of different characters. How different is his treatment of Mary and of Martha. Both of them required his help, both needed as it were the physician's healing art and medicine, and he wisely applies to each the appropriate remedies. To Martha, when she uses precisely the same words as Mary, he says, "Thy brother shall rise again." But in the case of Mary he seems to have been too much overpowered to reply, and at once says to the weeping friends, "Where have ye laid him?" as though he knew how deep, how profound was Mary's grief, and that the best way to heal it was by immediate action. He knew that Mary's nature was of a higher kind than her sister's, that her feelings had been much more wounded than Martha's, and so he hastened to comfort her in the most wonderful manner. Whether Mary did not like to go out into the crowd surrounding Christ in her abandonment of grief, or whether a secret despair and want of faith had overcome her for the moment, it is impossible to say, but at all events here also our Lord took just the right course in sending Martha for her, and then, immediately on her arrival proceeding with both the sisters to the grave of Lazarus and restoring the dead to life.

In the next chapter of St. John's Gospel we have the beautiful and affecting account of Mary's conduct. The depth of her love, and doubtless also of her sorrow for what seems to have been a momentary loss of faith on her part, is shown in the words, "An alabaster box of ointment *very precious*." She appears also by

* See on this point a most interesting paper by Mr. Minton in the Rainbow for January, 1876.

Digitized by Google

this act to have had a perception of the fact that our Lord was soon to suffer, for the words, "She has come to anoint my body to the burial," almost imply a consciousness on Mary's part that such would be the case. And her love and tenderness were thus rewarded by her being permitted to "do what she could" to comfort her Lord in his hour of trial and suffering. Her sitting at the feet of Jesus and hearing his word enabled her it would seem to comprehend more than even the Apostles.

Nor must we omit to notice the fact that of all the Apostles the one who doubted most, and was of the most sceptical turn of mind, the Apostle Thomas, was the first of them all to say, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." We are thus assured that even weak faith if it be but earnest and self-denying shall not go unrewarded, and, as the condescension of our Lord to Thomas, after his resurrection, shows, "a proof will be given to the doubt of love that is denied to the doubt of scorn." Thomas apparently was a man who was on all occasions of a sceptical or rather doubting turn of mind, but, as the above account shows, his love was very strong, and more ready to undergo trial and danger than that of any of the other Apostles, when he was once convinced.

Another most interesting point is also brought out in this chapter, viz., that our Lord was frequently misunderstood even by his own disciples, and that as a rule he called "things that be not as though they were:" that is to say, he always so looked on the future as almost to ignore the present. Thus when he said, "This sickness is not unto death," he spoke that which *would be* literally true, but which was not *then* true. He thus seemed to "keep the promise to the heart, though he broke it to the ear," exercising thereby the faith of his disciples, and teaching them to trust him even through death itself. Let us also believe that our Lord is able to turn his very denunciations into blessings, and that to those who trust in him light springs even out of darkness itself. It may be, and most probably is the case, that under his severest expressions there lie hid promises of future mercy and love. He is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think.

How many glorious results then flowed from our Lord's apparent neglect of his friend Lazarus. First, and chiefly, there was the bringing out and strengthening of the faith of his disciples. "I am glad," said the Lord, "for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe," thus proving to us that the faith of the disciples was yet weak and imperfect, and that God affords to those who follow him earnestly such further proofs as their cases may require for the increase of their faith. Secondly, the development of the character of Martha and Mary, and the beautiful proof afforded by Mary of her love and faith. And lastly, the sublime evidence to the world at large of the majesty of Christ, and his triumph over man's great enemy. All these could not have been

Digitized by Google

so signally manifested but for the sickness and death of Lazarus, and the fact of our Lord exercising over himself such severe self-restraint as to seem to take no notice of the message of Martha and Mary.

Another great and if possible more beautiful fact still was thereby brought to light, namely, the intense human sympathy of our Lord even with what he knows is only temporary sorrow. This is one of the points in his character which makes us love him. For his great power we may admire, and for his great wisdom we may worship him, but it is for such marvellous displays of feeling that we love as well as adore.

Let us never forget, moreover, that our Lord performed this great miracle for his friend at the risk, as he well knew and as the event proved, of his own life ; for it seems that this miracle was the immediate cause of the Pharisees and the rulers of the Jews clamouring for his crucifixion. The foreboding of Thomas was too truly fulfilled, but he was unable to see the glorious consequences that would ultimately follow. He could see only the suffering,—the sublime and infinitely glorious results were unknown to him.

May we not say, then, in conclusion, that our Lord's words were abundantly justified : " This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God."

* T. W.

RELATIVE ORDER OF THE MILLENNIUM AND THE ADVENT.

THAT there is to be a millennium, and that there is to be an advent, is generally admitted by Christian people. That the millennium and the advent sustain very definite and very important relations, is the general conviction. That one must precede, that the other will follow, is freely conceded. But will the advent precede the millennium ? or will the millennium precede the advent ? This is the vital question to be determined. *Will the Lord come to introduce the millennium ? or will the millennium prepare for the coming of the Lord ?* In some form or other the thoughtful mind propounds this inquiry, and in some way it must be answered. Until this point is settled, there is but little use for inquiry or disputation about any other relating to the general subject. The settlement of this cardinal question determines many others.

We do not purpose to enter upon a very extended argument in our investigation. We choose, rather, after a plain statement of two or three important facts, to put the inquirer on the track of the needful information, that he may be assisted in coming to the right conclusion. And, with reference to the specific question to be settled, we affirm : First. There is not a passage of Scripture,

Digitized by Google

literal, figurative, or symbolical, which treats of the millennium and its relation to the advent, that teaches, indicates, or in any manner represents the millennium as *preceding* the Advent. Second. There is not a passage, literal, figurative, or symbolical, which speaks of the advent and its relation to the millennium, that represents the advent as *subsequent* to the millennium.

Now, these two very important facts settle, if not the principal question at issue, at least this not unimportant fact that the now prevalent belief in a millennium previous to the advent is without Scripture authority. Since, as before stated, there is not one passage that speaks of the millennium and its relation to the advent, or of the advent and its relation to the millennium, which teaches directly or indirectly, by its immediate connections or its parallels, or in any manner whatever, the post-millenarian doctrines that are now so generally prevalent.

And yet, in the nature of the case, questions of order and relation must be decided by the authority which treats of order and relation. Isolated revelations—if there be such—cannot decide questions of relative order, unless—of which there is no example—the specific revelation should relate to the specific point to be established.

There is no dispute about the *fact* of our Lord's second advent. There is no dispute about the *fact* of a coming millennium. There is no dispute about the *fact* that the two great events sustain important chronological relations. The whole disagreement, as it respects the cardinal questions, is concerning the relative order. Is the millennium before the advent? Is the advent before the millennium? This is what should claim our attention first of all. A multitude of minor questions must be determined by this question of relative order.

This point must be decided, not by conjecture, nor by unauthorised statements, but by Divine revelation. Human authority is of little account in questions of this nature. If the Lord has not spoken it will be useless for man to speak. If he has spoken, "Thus saith the Lord" must be decisive.

Thus far we have treated the subject on the purposely-assumed logical ground that the Scriptures have not determined the question; thus leaving one side of the controversy as much without Divine authority as the other, and making it, therefore, a matter of logic, learning, and research. On this assumption, it would appear that the manifest advantage would be with the pre-millennialists for these reasons: First,—The post-millennialists being the witnesses, we prove that the pre-millenarian belief was *primitive* in the Christian church. And our advantage in this respect is equal to the probability of the TRUTH being primitive, and not ERROR, in the Church apostolically founded, guided, and instructed. Second,—Our advantage, on this assumption, still further appears from the fact, that authentic history, and still preserved formulas of belief, show that

Digitized by Google

pre-millennial views were *primitive* in the Reformed Protestant church. After the church came out from the communion of Rome, renouncing the human traditions, the manifold perversions of the Word of God, and the unauthorised assumptions of the Papacy, and planted itself upon the teachings of the Bible; then, as we have abundant testimony to prove, the primitive Protestant church, deriving the great foundation doctrines directly from the Word of God, was quite generally, if not universally, pre-millenarian in respect to this point of relative order. And our advantage in this respect is equal to the improbability that such men as God raised up, and wonderfully qualified for the reformation of the church, should generally, perhaps universally, misunderstand their diligently studied Bibles in respect to this vital question of relative order. Third,—On this assumption of equality, so far as it relates to direct revelation, our advantage as pre-millenarians is to be estimated as equal to the improbability that nearly all the chief founders of the subdivisions of the primitive Protestant churches—the theological giants of those heroic days—should be led into essential error on this vital question of relative order.

It will not be denied by those who have faithfully investigated this matter, that many, probably most, of the principal founders of the English, the Scotch, the Congregational, and the Baptist churches, and the larger portion of the Westminster Assembly, were decidedly millenarian; or, as we are using the term, pre-millenarian, in their belief and teaching. Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wycliffe, Melanchthon, all gave expression to convictions which showed that they looked for the advent before the complete subjection of the world to Christ. They seem to have apprehended the advent as very near. Not the prospect of the immediate triumph of the church, but the fearful ravages of the man of sin, impressed them that the day of the Lord was near. And this was evidently scriptural. Charles Wesley, the sweet singer of Methodism; Fletcher, the matchless polemic; and Coke, the father of Methodist missionary enterprise, all looked for the advent before the millennium.

And thus we might go on, almost indefinitely, and show conclusively that, on the assumption that the Bible leaves the question undecided as to the relative order of these two great events, the pre-millenarians evidently have the advantage of their opponents as to the probabilities of the case. It would invalidate all the axioms relating to the primitiveness of religious truth, in reference to the manifest illumination and providential guiding of those whom God has raised up for reformative purposes in his church; and it would conflict with all history and mental philosophy, as exhibited in innumerable instances, if we should be obliged to conclude that in the primitive church, in its first utterances of cardinal truths, as developed from the Word of God, radical error, and not essential truth, was primitive.

Digitized by Google

Since the great perversion and corruption in Eden, down to the latest development of heterodoxy, corruption of primitive truth, and not truth developed from corruption, has been the history of human kind. God may indeed reform and reclaim his people when they err and wander, and bring them back to *original* truth and virtue. But to assume that God suffered the primitive church to be established in essential error, and thus suffered the principal branches of the church in later times to be founded in essential error, in respect to the momentous question under review, is sufficiently alarming and humiliating, to say the least.

Having said so much, on the assumed ground of scriptural equality between the two sides of this great question, and of the advantage which pre-millenarians have over their opponents, on the supposition that the Bible leaves the question of relative order undetermined, we purpose now to abandon that merely assumed position, and boldly take the ground that this great question of the relative order of the millennium and the advent has been authoritatively decided by the Word of God; not by one passage only, which, if it were clear, would settle the whole controversy, but by passages literal, figurative, and symbolical, almost without number. And we do not forget that the Word of God is to be understood, not as any of us might wish, hope, or endeavour to make it appear; but fairly, consistently, and according to its Divine adaptation to impress the unsophisticated mind.

"To the law and to the testimony." The question to be settled being one of order and relation in respect to the two great associated events, the coming of the Lord and the coming of the millennium, it is necessary to determine the point by Scriptures that relate to these two events in their associated order. A text merely proving the millennium, since it proves as much for one side as the other, proves nothing in respect to the point now under discussion. Sometimes reference is made to explicit revelations of the millennium, without regard to the connections and parallels of the passage, and it is assumed that these isolated and fragmentary passages, since they prove the millennium, settle the question of relative order. The eighth verse of the second Psalm, the ninth verse of the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, and half a dozen texts of similar nature, which, indeed, prove the *fact* of the millennium, and are, therefore, in this respect, just as favourable to one side as the other, appear to be stereotyped arguments on the post-millennial side, and are quoted with a frequency and a confidence which leave no doubt concerning the convictions of those who refer to them, as authoritative judgments in the great question in dispute. Whereas, the careful examination of these isolated quotations will demonstrate the fact, which seems to have escaped the notice of many, that these texts either prove nothing at all relative to this question, or else—which is usually the case—by their immediate connections, or their parallels, distinctly prove the pre-

Digitized by Google

millennial doctrine concerning the relative order of the two principal events.

The portions of Scripture which relate to these associated events, and which are relevant to the argument, therefore, because they indicate the relative order of the events, are very numerous, and, by their connections and parallels, easily interpreted, in strict accordance with the established usages and laws of literary criticism. But as it would unduly extend this article to quote in full all the passages which we might examine, in order to fix the meaning of isolated and fragmentary texts, by carefully considering their connections and their parallels, the thoughtful, who are willing to give this important subject a little attention, are desired to read what immediately follows:—

1. The eleventh chapter of Isaiah is by all, perhaps, admitted to refer to the millennial state of the world in connection with the kingdom and reign of Christ. It exhibits, (1.) The manner in which millennial blessedness is brought in. (2.) The state of the world and its inhabitants during the happy period after it is fully established. (3.) The conversion and restoration of Israel and Judah "in that day." Verses 10–16 refer to this latter event. Verses 6–9 describe the state of millennial blessedness. Verses 1–5 describe the manner in which the millennial state is introduced. This examination will determine what is the testimony of inspiration concerning the vital point of relative order.

Connected with this disputed point are the two conflicting theories respecting the introduction of the millennium: the one, by the increase and triumph of grace, by which the whole world is converted; the other, not specifying how far grace will ultimately triumph, but at a certain period introducing Christ, not as the priestly successor of Aaron, but as the royal heir and successor of David, ruling, judging, rewarding and punishing.

Taking these two theories of the introduction and establishment of the millennial dispensation, as the necessary concomitants and exponents of the two theories of the relative order of the advent and the millennium, which one of them is sustained, and which disproved by the eleventh chapter and ninth verse of Isaiah, *interpreted by its connection?* By carefully reading the chapter it will be seen that *Christ is present*, not to save sinners, as he is now doing in heaven, but to judge and to destroy them. (Ver. 4.) Christ is present in his royal relations to David, the son of Jesse, exercising his regal authority and power among the nations, and judicially smiting and destroying the wicked. (Verse 1–5.) And in this manner he brings in the millennium. With which of the two conflicting theories does this representation agree? Is the millennium introduced, without the personal presence of Christ, by the spiritual triumphs of the Gospel until all are converted? Or is it introduced, in connection with the personal presence of Christ, not then converting his enemies to friends, and saving them, but

Digitized by Google

finding them enemies, treating them as enemies, judging and destroying them as enemies? In short, does the millennium introduce Christ at the close of it? or does he appear at the beginning of it, and reign during the continuance of it? What does this millennial prophecy, interpreted harmoniously with itself throughout, teach us concerning this vital question of relative order respecting the advent and the millennium?

2. We turn now to the Second Psalm, a portion of Scripture which is more frequently quoted, perhaps, against the pre-millenarians than any other passage in the Bible. It is conceded by all that this psalm, especially the eighth verse, describes the kingdom of Christ upon the earth, and this eighth verse seems to be regarded by the opponents of pre-millenarianism as a triumphant demonstration of the complete spiritual subjection of the whole world to Christ by the Gospel. No one can reasonably object to the interpretation of a text by its intimate connections and evident parallels. This we now proceed to do, with reference to the great question now under consideration. Which of the two conflicting theories is favoured by the second Psalm?

Hence we notice, first of all, King Messiah, not on the priestly throne in heaven, exercising the offices of mediation and intercession, but as the Lord's anointed king, throned upon the holy hill of Zion; not to save the disobedient among the nations, but to rule, judge, and destroy them. (Verses 5–9.) And thus making this psalm parallel with the many other prophecies of his judicial procedure in ruling and preparing the world for his universal kingdom. According to this psalm, he first appears as the appointed king in Zion. The jealous rulers of the unsubdued nations become excited and enraged. What becomes of them? Do they submit to Christ, yield to his Gospel, become his friends, and finally obtain salvation? Or do they continue in hatred and rebellion until the time of mercy expires, and then perish under his judicial wrath? The question has manifest pertinency as an exhibition of the method by which the result is brought about, which we all agree to call the millennial state. What is the testimony of the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, in this psalm? It exhibits the period of "the wrath of the Lamb." (Verse 12; compare Rev. vi. 16.) The wicked rulers and judges of the earth are exhorted to "kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little."

And yet this very psalm, or a disconnected fragment of it, rather, is the perpetual resort for proof of the whole world's spiritual subjection to Christ through the Gospel, and that the world will be converted before the coming of Christ! Whereas, in the first place, there is no such universal conversion to Christ indicated in this psalm; but, instead thereof, a terrible and universal destruction of his enemies is signified. And, in the second place, Christ, as king upon the hill of Zion, is distinctly represented as having

Digitized by Google

already come; as being personally present, ruling, judging, and destroying his enemies in his hot, judicial displeasure. And this signifies universal conversion to Christ! This means the spiritual subjection of the wicked world, and the ushering in of the millennium before the coming of the King in Zion!

Permit us to inquire, Does this *breaking with a rod of iron*, this *dashing in pieces as a potter's vessel*, this *vexing them in his sore displeasure*, this being *angry* with them, and causing them to *perish from the way when his wrath is kindled*—does all this indicate a work of *love* and *salvation?* Is this the moral triumph of the Gospel? Would any one ever receive—did any one, could any one ever receive such an impression from these terrible threatenings and this awful imagery, if he had not a previously-formed and a fondly-cherished dogmatic theory that demanded this violence to all the recognised rules and usages of literary criticism, and this unparalleled perversion of the natural teachings of verbal statements and symbolic imagery? Is there an admitted example in any book, except the Bible, where such terrible imagery and verbalism are ever used to indicate a reformative, merciful work of grace, and not of judicial wrath and severity? If such be the appropriate expression of love and mercy, what would be the legitimate expression of the opposite? Furthermore, if this imports mercy and redemption, why is it held up as a warning to wicked kings and judges, lest it should be visited upon them, and they should perish under his wrath?

The true parallel of the second Psalm is Rev. ii. 25–27: "But that which ye have, hold fast TILL I COME. And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, *to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers:* EVEN AS I RECEIVED OF MY FATHER."

Now, it is the teaching of the Word of God that the saints are to "reign with Christ;" that "the saints shall judge the world;" that when the Lord shall return from his "journey into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return," charging the servants whom he leaves behind, "*Occupy till I come*" (Luke xix. 12–27); it is the Scripture doctrine that the faithful servants will, at their Lord's return, "having received the kingdom," "enter into the joy of their Lord," which is more definitely explained, "have thou authority over ten cities."

But when and where is this governmental association with Christ, as the *returned King*, to be realised? Not "now in this time" (Mark x. 30), but in the "*palingenesia*" (Matt. xix. 28), "when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory" (Psalm ii. 6), when the twelve apostles shall "sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Can anything be plainer than this? Is not this a manifestly just and natural method of interpreting the Word of God by its immediate connections and evident parallels?

Digitized by Google

The bearing of this argument upon the question at issue is unmistakable.

We boldly affirm, after due examination, and after weighing well the statement, that there is not a passage in the Bible relating to the great question in this controversy, interpreted fairly by its associations and parallels, that does not distinctly indicate the pre-millennial theory of the relative order of the millennium and the advent, and that does not as distinctly disprove the theory of the opposite.

We have thus far considered some of the passages most relied upon apparently to sustain the anti or post-millennium theory, and have shown, from their connections and parallels, that the true millennial, or, as we prefer to call it, the pre-millennial, theory of exposition is not only legitimate, scriptural, self-consistent, and logically demonstrative; but that it is the only interpretation possible for those passages, without doing violence to literary axioms, Scripture precedents, and the legitimate impressions of symbolical imagery and common verbalism. And we are genuine Protestants, believing that the Bible was intended for the *people*; for those who mainly rely upon the *legitimate impression* which the language and imagery of inspiration produce upon the uncorrupted mind.

If there is anything more unmistakably revealed than another, respecting the state of the world at the advent, it is this: that it will take the world by surprise. "As a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. It will come as a thief in the night. When they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape." The advent will not be when it is generally expected, but when it is not. Now this must be accounted for, for it is unmistakably revealed. And which of the two theories is best adapted to explain it? Let us suppose that the pre-millennial theory is generally prevalent at that decisive epoch, and that the advent is considered imminent, and is daily watched for and expected. Would the world then be overtaken by the advent unexpectedly? Certainly not.

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that a false theory is generally prevalent at that epoch; for example, that the advent is not to occur until after the millennium, whereas it takes place before. Would not this general misapprehension of the true order of the events completely explain the predicted fact as to the unexpectedness of the Advent? Which, then, of the two theories is the more likely to be the true one? Would the general prevalence of essential *error*, respecting the relative order of events, be the best preparation for the primal event? Again, would the general prevalence of *true* impressions, as to the relative order of events, be the occasion of general unpreparedness for the primal event? Certainly not. Which, then, of these conflicting theories gives the *rationale* of the undeniable fact?

Digitized by Google

Do post-millenarians dissent from applying this simple test to the pre-millenarian side of the question, and consent to apply it to the advent subsequent to the millennium? Consider the logical consequences: 1. It would not then be a question of *relative order*, as it is now. For, as the advent did not occur at the beginning of the millennium, it must, of course, occur at the end of it; and it would then be a question of *belief or disbelief of the Word of God;* inasmuch as the advent is predicted to take place either at the opening, or at the close of that dispensation. 2. The general unpreparedness of the world at that time, as the supposition is, would show that general disbelief of what is distinctly revealed in the Word of God will characterise the close of the millennium.

As it would be impossible to compress within the limits of this article the examination of a tithe of the passages of Scripture which we deem decisive in settling this great controversy respecting the relative order of the millennium and the advent, we must be content with the consideration of only a few, and these chiefly from the sayings of our Lord Jesus Christ. It will be remembered that we are not discussing the general subject of the millennium, nor the general subject of the advent, nor the numberless collateral and more or less dependent questions which are usually treated in connection with the general theme. All these are more or less important in a general discussion, but they are purposely excluded from this. The settlement of the great question now under immediate review will necessarily dispose of many of the collateral issues.

How did our Lord represent the relative order of these two great events? While it must be admitted by all that he did not use the term millennium, yet it will not be denied by any that he often referred to a coming state or dispensation, when, as all, perhaps, will agree, the millennial prophecies will be fulfilled. His kingdom will come, and his will shall be done upon earth as it is in heaven. He will gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity. The righteous shall yet shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. The meek shall inherit the earth. The apostles will yet sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Isarel. The obedient and the faithful shall yet enter into the joy of their Lord. We are not now called upon to give the precise signification of these various representations of the coming glory and blessedness of the true disciples. Perhaps even millenarians might not exactly coincide in their views of the particulars included in the general representation of the coming felicity. But the good time coming must include the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. It must then embrace the millennial blessedness promised to the church in this world. To suppose that our Lord overleaped and overlooked the millennial state, as of

Digitized by Google

too little consequence to be referred to, and contemplated only what we usually call heaven, or the eternal state, will not be admitted by any true millenarian of either of the two kinds contemplated in this article.

With this restricted view of the general subject, let us for a little consider the great prophecy respecting His coming, and the end of the world.* [Not *kosmos*, but *aion*.] Leaving untouched innumerable topics, which might unnecessarily detain and embarrass us, we consider only these :—

1. Here is a chain of prophecy that stretches through the whole breadth of this dispensation, beginning chronologically with the first persecution of the infant church, and extending down to the coming of the Lord at the end of the *aion*, when the Master returns to reward the watchful and the obedient, and to punish the disobedient and the disbelieving.

2. There is not the slightest indication of any such condition of general virtue and blessedness as the Scriptures authorise us to expect in that age, dipensation, or state that we denominate the millennium.

3. Instead of all becoming holy and harmless, the unfaithful and the unbelieving continue so until the end, and are found by the returning Master eating and drinking with the drunken, and smiting their fellow-servants, and screening themselves with the plea, "My Lord delayeth his coming." Is there any millennium here ?

4. The days of persecution, distress, and tribulation continue until the last ; so that the signs of the Lord's coming follow "immediately after the tribulation of those days."

5. The day of the Lord, or the coming of the Son of man, overtakes the unbelieving, unwatchful, unprepared generations by surprise, as they are eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, as the Noachian flood came upon the wicked antediluvians and took them all away. The Lord will come "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. i. 8), as the fire-storm fell upon Sodom and consumed them in ther lusts.

6. There is not in all this broad prophecy, that covers the whole dispensation, extending down to the end of the *aion* [as long as the Gospel commission continues, Matt. xxviii. 20], the slightest intimation of such a state of the world, or of the church, as the millennial prophecies give us reason to expect.

7. Closing up the long-continuing *aion*, during which wickedness and the wicked continue until the end, the Lord suddenly comes to reward and punish.

Thus have we explored the whole breadth of this dispensational sea. Launching out on the first advent side of it, we have sailed

* Matt. xxiv., and parallels.

Digitized by Google

in search of the millennial isle; but we have not discovered it. We know where it is indicated in the modern charts; but we have traversed every Scripture parallel of longitude and latitude in that vicinity, and have not found it. We have found the Second Advent on the farther coast; but there is no island of Paradise this side of it.

Is there any millennial indication *beyond the advent?*

1. We find, in connection with the advent, a gathering together of the elect from the four winds of heaven. So here we have the proper subjects of the expected blessedness.

2. We find them redeemed from all the tribulation which afflicted them through all the Gospel *aion* until the close of it. The Lord has added to his description of the signs of the advent these words of instruction and cheer: "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." So here we have assurance of the good things that follow.

3. That state is of the nature of a *kingdom*. When the Son of man is revealed from heaven, coming in his glory, he will sit upon the throne of his glory, and speak and act as "the King." This will be in perfect accord with all the prophecies of the millennium; for it is almost invariably represented as a kingdom—the Son of David reigning upon David's throne. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." (Luke i. 32.) See, also, the whole of the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, and the almost innumerable parallel passages.

4. Then our Lord is careful to fix the time of the introduction of the kingdom, showing that it is not to be expected until the period of the advent: "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the KINGDOM OF GOD is nigh at hand." (Luke xxi. 31.) Is not this the period when "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him?" (Dan. vii. 27.) Is not this indeed the fulfilment of that petition which the Lord has put into the heart and mouth of the church, "Thy kingdom come;* thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven?"

5. So here we find the saints associated with the Lord, after his advent, possessing the kingdom, which *comes* in connection with the advent. Here is the consummation of the millennial prophecies, relating both to the King and the happy subjects of his dominion. They do not *go* to find the kingdom; it *comes* to them, in fulfilment of prophecy, and in answer to the petition in the Lord's prayer. The kingdom is "under the whole heaven." When the kingdom *comes*, the will of God is done "*on earth*, as it

---

* *Eltheto*, from *erkomai*, to COME; never to *extend*, or to *increase*.

Digitized by Google

is in heaven." Now the saints "reign with him." Now "the saints shall judge the world." Is not this the Bible millennium?

6. But where do we find this millennium? What is its chronological relation to the advent? Is it *before?* No. Is it *after?* Yes. Who teaches this? Christ. Let us continue sitting at the feet of this Divine Teacher. With reverential docility let our ears be attentive to the words of his lips. Lord, we would know unto what the kingdom of heaven is like. Not the kingdom of heaven in heaven, but the kingdom of heaven upon earth: the kingdom in that stage or dispensation when Thy will is done on earth as it is in heaven, We would understand the relations of the kingdom to the present dispensation; the origin of the present admixture of good and evil; whether this state of things will continue until the end of the present economy [*aion*], or whether, previous to the end, all the wicked shall become obedient to Thy commands, and all wickedness be cleansed away. Speak, Lord, for Thy servants are waiting to hear. D. D. B.

SUFFICIENT.

I CANNOT tell why shade and light
Should make my life now dark, now bright;
I only know
That he who portions out my days,
And guideth me in all my ways,
Will have it so.

I cannot know the hid designs
Of him who all my course defines;
I only trace
The purpose like a guiding thread,
By which as yet my life is led,
And seems of grace.

I cannot trace with piercing sight
My onward course, which lies through night;
I only see
A Light which goeth on before,
And shineth ever more and more,
While guiding me.

I cannot see what inner need
Requires so oft my heart should bleed;
I only feel
That he who woundeth it so sore,
Is nigh, before the pain is o'er,
To soothe and heal.

Digitized by Google

I cannot feel that love may reign
Joy-crowned in me on earth again;
I only hope
That in some other happier sphere,
The dear affections thwarted here
May find their scope.

I cannot hope that woe no more
May wound my heart as heretofore;
I only trust
That all God's reasons for my lot,
The reasons which he telleth not,
Are wise and just.

I cannot trust the whispered thought
That life will yet bring all I sought;
I only build
My faith on this assured decree,
That all which God intends for me
Shall be fulfilled.

I cannot build on self-made plan,
Of works I choose to do, and can;
I only ask
That he to do whose will I live,
May with my daily portion give
My daily task.

I cannot ask to 'scape the fight
In which wrong wrestles here with right;
I only pray
That I upon right's side may be,
And that my God will fight with me,
And win the day.

I cannot pray to miss my cross,
And share of common grief and loss;
I only long
To hear, beyond earth's moans and cries,
And join, above her silent skies,
The triumph song!

* H. L. M. (*Author of "Angel Visits."*)

NATURE AND ITS LEANING.

IT is a common saying that "Nature is nature," and true of man as it is of the brute. Do what we will, nature will run its course. Civilisation or education may arrest or tone down the brutality that clings to man in his natural state, but grace only can change it. One said, when pleading for her own civilised and highly

Digitized by Google

educated self: "Nature has its redeeming qualities." But where are they to be found should something upset the nicely balanced equilibrium? Touch her property or self-interest, and civilisation, with its educated self-restraint, is excited beyond control, and the "redeeming qualities" are shivered to pieces. God said by the mouth of his prophet Jeremiah: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye" (but not until then) "also do good that are accustomed to do evil." (Jer. xiii. 23.) Dirt contracted may be washed off, but we cannot alter the colour of a single hair, much less that of the skin. The "redeeming qualities" of an educated man may render him not so gross and filthy as may be seen in low life; but a thoroughly unregenerate man is by nature the same alike in all,—"earthly, sensual, devilish." (Jas. iii. 15.) Selfishness cannot be rooted out by education, and selfishness is the very antipodes of Christianity. Redeeming qualities indeed! a dirty cloth cannot wash itself; then "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" asks Job (xiv. 4), and his reply is, "Not one." So far from it, he declares, "If I wash myself with snow water, and make my hands never so clean, yet shalt thou plunge me in a ditch, and mine own clothes shall abhor me;" and God says, "Though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me." Such is the natural state of man at the present hour; in fact, "sold under sin." "Certain philosophers of the school of Voltaire and Gibbon, have been extravagant in their eulogium of man in a state of nature, or in some other state devoid of Christianity," says Buchanan; "and it is to be lamented that some Christian writers have tried to draw the same picture. But Paganism, in its best estate, is well described by one line of the poet:—

"Monstrum, horrendum, infamee, ingens, cui Luman ademptum."
Æn. iii. 658.*

We need not, however, go beyond the first chapter of Romans to ask what man is by nature. We have it from the pen of inspiration. Indeed the question between Voltaire and Rousseau, "Whether the savage or the civilised state were preferable?" is one of the greatest arguments for the utter depravation of our species. The mere naked fact, that such a question had arisen amongst rational beings, whether they should continue in a state allied to the brute, or exert the very faculties which constituted them a species, is enough,—we need go no farther.

M. Tocqueville, the learned author of "Democracy in America," observes, "that if we study history, it will appear that, in general, barbarous nations have raised themselves to a state of civilisation by slow degrees, and through their own unassisted exertions. Whenever they have derived any light from a strange nation, it has

* Christian Researches, p. 101. London: Cadell.

Digitized by Google

been when they stood, with regard to it, in the relation of a conquering, not a conquered race." He cites no instance,—and indeed he could not. But we may ask, "from what quarter could our first parents have obtained those germs of improvement, which have been transmitted by some portion of their descendants, through a succession of ages?" The only answer is,—*By inspiration from above;* for as we are conscious that man could not make himself, and which is a proof of a Divine Creator, so the impossibility of man civilising himself may be brought forward as a proof of a Divine Instructor.

There is no solid civilisation except that founded on the Word of God. Apart from that knowledge which cometh down from above, the leaning of nature in nationalities is to return to its normal condition. Let me give a few instances in proof; and first of all the words of one whom we have learned to love in death as he was beloved in life (the Rev. Dr. Guthrie). "I knew a boy belonging to this race" (the Tartars), "whom his parents had been induced to leave with a kind, Christian family, under whose roof he had enjoyed many advantages—a comfortable home, good and regular meals, instruction in letters, and in habits of honest industry. Yet, notwithstanding these, and after being to appearance tamed, so strong were the charms of his old life, that he seized the first opportunity of returning to it, like the young chamois which a shepherd of the Alps caught, and, hanging a bell from its neck, reared with his goats. It seemed to be quite domesticated; going and returning with the herd, till a day when it happened to hear the cry of its own wild race amid the mountain rocks. The creature started and listened. For some moments it stood in an attitude of eager attention, trembling with intense excitement; and then, all of a sudden bounding from the meadow, it sprang into the cliff, and leaping from crag to crag, vanished among the heights, where it joined its kindred, and was never more seen; though for years thereafter its bell was often heard tinkling among the rocks, and the mists that shrouded them." It was natural; it was nature and its leaning. Man, unaided and left to his own resources, has never risen from a lower to a higher state. On the contrary, we find the vices which early ages discountenanced and forbade, becoming not only universally practised, but even shamefully deified, and the God of man's first pure faith multiplied into hundreds, in some cases into thousands, and in a few into millions of inferior and usually immoral deities. What a remarkable declension there was in the Old World. Almost ere the grey fathers of the flood were dead; ere perhaps the marks of its awful ravages had vanished from the face of the earth, mankind had forgotten its lesson, and began to worship the creature in place of the Creator. Abraham certainly was the son of an idolater, if not one himself, and if old Jewish and Mohammedan traditions are to be believed, Abraham's father was a maker as well as a worshipper of idols. "Your fathers," said

Digitized by Google

Joshua, "dwelt on the other side of the flood, even Terah the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor, and they served other gods." But God called Abraham away from his idolatrous family, and kept him as he walked with God.

We are told by the philosophers of the age that man's primeval state was not one from which he fell, but from which he rose,—one, in fact, of lowest savagedom. But history, apart from Scripture, does not show a nation or a being rising from a lower to a higher condition, but the reverse. Examine the legends of the rudest tribes, and they will be found to contain memories, though misty, of a past but higher and nobler state of being; of arts, of accomplishments, of a refinement of manners, and of, in many instances, a purity of morals which only exist among them now in tales and songs. Not tradition only, but all history besides, proves that man, left to his own resources, has not risen but invariably sunk in the scale. Whoever examines the records of nations will find that the tendency of morals has always been to become more corrupt, and the tendency of religions to become more idolatrous and impure. They exhibit a constantly increasing departure from the truth. In proof of this we may appeal to the history, among extinct nations, of Greece and Rome; and amongst existing ones, of India and China. Trace their morals and religion upwards and as we advance nearer to their source, we find the one becoming less impure, and the other less untrue, until a period is reached when the resemblance between these and the moral and religious belief of the patriarchs is striking, and is indeed quite remarkable. It is like ascending a river whose waters are polluted by the towns and manufactories that have sprung up on its banks; the nearer we approach the green hills where it springs from its fountain, the purer runs the stream. Man, we repeat, unaided and left to his own resources, has never risen from a lower to a higher grade. Perhaps some sceptic may assert this to be visionary, or at all events, not applicable to our present enlightened era. Well, one fact is worth a thousand arguments, and I will quote a few in proof. The late well-known and beloved Rev. John Newton, we read of in the "Memoirs" by Cecil, says when he was located in Kittam, Africa: "There is a significant phrase frequently used in these parts, that such a white man is grown black. I have known several who, settling in Africa after the age of thirty or forty, have at that time of life been gradually assimilated to the tempers, customs, and ceremonies of the natives, so far as to prefer that country to England; they have even become dupes to all the pretended charms, necromancies, amulets, and divinations of the blinded negroes, and put more trust in such things than the wiser sort among the natives. A part of this spirit of infatuation was growing upon me; in time, perhaps, I might have yielded to the whole. I entered into closer engagements with the natives, and should have lived and died a wretch amongst them, if the Lord had not

Digitized by Google

watched over me for good." This was about the middle of the eighteenth century.

In the course of last century, England was charmed by the visit of Omai from Tahiti, brought by Captain Cook. He was young and graceful, engaging in his manners and polite in his address. The ease and even the elegance of his manners was an object of surprise to all parties. He soon became the fashion of the day. On his arrival in London he was introduced as a prodigy to fashionable parties, conducted to the splendid entertainments of the highest circles, and presented to the British court amidst a brilliant assemblage of all that was illustrious in rank and dignified in station. For four years he was England's guest, and then was sent back with Captain Cook on his next voyage to the Friendly Islands. The visit of this young man enlisted the warm feelings of Cowper, who thus speaks of his visit and return to Tahiti :—

> The dream is past. And thou hast again
> Thy cocoas and bananas, palms and yams,
> And homestall thatched with leaves. But hast thou found
> Their former charms? And having seen our state,
> Our palaces, our ladies, and our pomp
> Of equipage; our gardens, and our sports,
> And heard our music; are thy simple friends,
> Thy simple fare, and all thy plain delights,
> As dear to thee as once?

Alas! nature and its leanings has its way; for we learn from his after history, this poor islander, transplanted for a time into the heart of civilisation, returned again to his home, and became almost a bane to his fellow-countrymen. He soon threw off his European dress, and re-adopted the uncivilised manners and mode of life of his people. The remainder of his life appears to have been passed in fruitless indolence or wanton crime. He became the instrument of the caprice or cruelty of the king of the island, who not only availed himself of the aid of his firearms in periods of war, but frequently ordered him to shoot at a man at a certain distance, in order to see how far the musket could do execution; or to despatch with his pistol, in the presence of the king, the ill-fated objects of his resentment. Well might Cowper conclude his poem with :—

> Doing good,
> Disinterested good, is not our trade.
> We travel far, 'tis true, but not for nought;
> And must be bribed to compass earth again
> By other hopes and richer fruits than yours.

So much for nature and its leaning, civilised and savage. Civilised life and manners made the savage man to be dreaded more than before.

We need not go so far back as the last century to see nature and its leanings, for we read of various freaks of nature in the

Digitized by Google

daily papers of the present time. The following cuttings from our "Dailies" are but a few from many, and are worthy of note. In May, 1869, a Fiji Island correspondent of the *Honolulu Gazette* says there are at Labruka, in the Island of Ovalava, about forty foreigners, all sailors, most of whom have run away from ships and turned Fijians. The principal man among them, and the one who has most influence with the chiefs,—and in fact is a very respectable and steady (?) man,—is David Whiffey, who, thirty years ago, left a Nantucket whaler, and making friends with the chiefs of Labruka, settled there. He has a number of wives and a large family. Later on, i.e. in July, 1870, we are informed that Captain Rimington, or rather now Mr. Rimington, who left Oudh about three years ago, having embraced the Hindoo religion, has returned to Lucknow. He is still as much a Hindoo as ever. For *how much* it does not say. Later still we have another experience of one who is not ashamed to sign his name to his confession of faith: the scrap is dated August 20th, 1871, and is entitled, "Reverting to the Faith of his Fathers." Some excitement has been caused by the return of a baptized Parsee to the faith of his fathers. The pervert announces the fact in the Guzerati papers in these terms: "I, the undersigned, give notice, that I, with ceremonies, re-embraced the Zoroastrian religion, on the 19th of July, 1871, and relinquished Christianity, by my own free will and faith.—Dababhai Rustomjee, Muccadum."

We have several other specimens of "Nature and its leaning," but the above is quite sufficient for our purpose. May the prayer of our souls be, "Lord, leave us not to our own resources,—hold thou me up, and I shall be safe." How true are the words of the royal preacher, "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." (Eccles. vii. 29.)

Cramlington. GEORGE LLOYD.

PROXYISM.

"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

NO motley assembly, that is to say no average gathering of such as profess and call themselves Christians, would long tolerate in the pulpit a Paul, a Tyndale, or a Milton; but a motley assembly will willingly sustain a priest, and clothe him moreover in purple and fine linen; and the reason is obvious. The former teachers having premised the advent of a Saviour as potential for the gift of life and the forgiveness of sins that were past, but as leaving unshaken the eternal doctrine that "pardon is not impunity," had nothing further to enforce but righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come. But now turn to the priestly system. No

Digitized by Google

sooner is it felt that these topics require abstinence from indulgence than contrivances are at hand to take duty out of the domain of morality, and transfer it to the observance of ecclesiastical action and the payment of a money tribute. To the priest meanwhile is relegated the arena of speculative dogma, and a pretty thing he makes of it. It is now his turn to mount the rostrum. He assures the people that by this felicitous arrangement they have made the best of both worlds; and the people like to believe it, for their favourite enjoyments and occupations are in no way interfered with; while even the very forms and ceremonies which are to constitute their passport to eternal life are so skilfully adapted to domestic and social instincts as to become mere episodes in fashionable life. Thus it comes to pass, as Mr. Froude has recently observed, "Religion, which ought to have been a restraint, becomes a fresh instrument of evil; to the imaginative and the weak, a contemptible superstition; to the educated, a mockery; to knaves and hypocrites, a cloke of iniquity; to all alike, to those who suffer and to those who seem to profit by it, a lie so palpable as to be worse than atheism itself."—[*Calvinism. An address delivered before the University of St. Andrews*, p. 17.] It is in full accordance with utterances such as this that an English Cathedral Canon has recently been exposing his own Order by Essays bearing the following titles, "Modern Christianity a Civilised Heathenism," and "Everlasting Punishment. Do our Clergy believe in it?" Such is the result of the reign of priests and the practice of human proxy. Reader,—our one great and glorious Proxy, who has passed into the heavens, is also our Exemplar. If we follow him, his Spirit will infallibly guide us into all truth. J. WAYLEN.

FAITH AND HOPE.

GOD'S Lamb—was on the altar laid!
God's love declares my ransom paid!
And now within the veil with God
The Lamb has entered with his blood.

The book of life lies open there
With names of sinners crimsoned o'er:
With tints of earth? Nay! blood Divine!
And underneath the blood lies mine.

Now looking upward without fear
Hope often whispers Christ is near;
And when the sunlight gilds a cloud
I ask, "Does it my Saviour shroud?"

And thus I wait and watch each day:—
Would watching dream my nights away;
Impatient for his nearer care,
But certain, mercy keeps him there. H. BURNETT.

Digitized by Google

UNCONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

WHAT satisfactory proof—if any—can be adduced, in support of the popular assumption that man is, essentially and by creation, an immortal being? The object of the following paper is to give a concise, candid, and yet tolerably comprehensive answer to this profoundly interesting and important question,—a question which has ever seemed to us to underlie the whole controversy on "Conditional Immortality" in its scriptural aspect. And we have been the rather led to take it up at the present time, by observing that neither at the recent Conference on Conditional Immortality at the Cannon Street Hotel, nor in some of the publications on the general question which have of late issued from the press, such as Dr. Petavel's excellent little volume, "*The Struggle for Eternal Life*," and the very candid and judicious pamphlet on "*Everlasting Punishment*" by Mr. J. J. Hobbs, of Blandford, has this all-important question received more than very cursory notice.

We do not hesitate to call it an all-important question, because we must maintain—and have ever done so since this subject first engaged our attention—that until *it* is answered, neither a true psychology nor a scriptural eschatology can possibly be constructed. We cannot even admit that we are quite prepared to say, with Mr. Minton,* that "we are willing to rest our whole cause on the natural *primâ facie* meanings of the words, 'life' and 'death,' 'immortality' and 'destruction,'" as found in those inspired Scriptures to which we make our final appeal, at least till this previous question has been settled. For if it could be demonstrated, either from reason or from Scripture, that man *is*, essentially and by creation, an immortal being; then, we apprehend, we may be constrained to interpret these and similar words and phrases in a non-natural, or, shall we say, in a metaphorical and spiritual sense; but if, on the other hand, as we contend and shall endeavour to show, no such proof can be adduced, then assuredly we are not only at liberty but bound to understand them in their natural and *prima facie* meanings.

The question, then, is fundamental; and as it is finally determined, so, as it seems to us, must—alike for the individual Christian and for Christendom—be the whole controversy. But such being the case, it is surely a most reasonable and reverent conclusion, that if man *is* naturally and unconditionally immortal,—that is, destined to continue in conscious existence as long as God himself,—clear and sufficient evidence of the momentous fact will have been vouchsafed by a just and gracious Creator to the beings whom he has, of his own will, dowered with so awful and—as events have proved—so disastrous a gift. Nay, we do not hesitate to say, that having regard to the unspeakable importance of the knowledge of such a fact to those to whom it is supposed to relate, and the tremendous issues involved in it, there rests *a moral obligation* on the Most High to supply the most ample evidence, not to say demonstrative proof, thereof. Again, then, we ask,—Is any such evidence to be found? The sources from whence it might conceivably be drawn are four, and only four, in number: (1.) Science; (2.) Reason; (3.) Inspiration, and (4.) Scripture. Let us briefly interrogate these oracles in their order.

---

* Speech at Cannon Street Conference.

Digitized by Google

I. SCIENCE. That the testimony of this great ruling power of the modern world, of which it may be said with a deeper emphasis than that of Job, "its eye seeth every precious thing, and that which is hid bringeth it forth to light," is altogether *adverse* not only to the idea of an absolutely eternal existence, but even, so far as its proper province extends, to the hope and expectation of any existence whatever for man after death, will be admitted by those who are at all acquainted with its latest conclusions in the department of biology: the great doctrine of Evolution,—now established on so vast an induction of the most varied phenomena that he who rejects it, as at least a provisional hypothesis, does little more than display either his ignorance of the subject or his theological prejudice,*—having dealt a death-blow to all hopes of human immortality not resting on the operation of spiritual laws.

"The animal races are produced by a generative process of which every step is wonderful, but in which there is no ascertainable distinction between the vital and organic elements of their constitution. In each creature produced under these processes there is a living germ which has power to build up the organisation with all its members, faculties, and mental or sensitive capacities. No one can separate even in thought the life from the organism in which it coheres. The faculty is the effect of the development. When the organism dissolves, the life dissolves with it.

"Mankind, say these biologists, is produced by processes not merely analogous but identical. There is absolutely no difference, as an ancient philosopher observed, between the process through which is born the 'wild ass's colt,' and that by which man is brought forth upon the earth. What we call mind in man is created under universal laws of the brain-producing energy of nature. We trace up sensation, instinct, thought, developed in constant connection with nervous and cerebral systems, from the lowest to the highest organisms. There is steady progress in the organisation, but in all cases alike the productive process is one. With brain and ganglia there is mind, without them none. The laws which govern the hereditary transmission of qualities and powers are the same for all. If a common mode of origination may furnish any indication of destiny, comparative physiology holds out no hope of survival for the human intelligence in that death, common to animals and mankind, which seems to swallow up organism and faculty in one abyss of destruction."†

Nor is this negative evidence by any means confined to the department of comparative physiology; the wider study of the physical universe does but deepen and confirm it; for not only man himself, but the whole material system of which he forms a part, seems destined to

---

* The well-known American preacher, Dr. Talmage,—who will hardly be accused of being too liberal in his theological opinions,—recently wrote in his own paper: "It is by no means impossible that Evolution may take its place as a great scientific fact; it is beyond all question that there is no line in the Bible against it, nor any truth embodied in it which the Christian may not gratefully accept and cherish."

† "*Life in Christ*," by the Rev. Edward White, p. 7: by far the most profound, exhaustive and scholarly work which this controversy has yet produced. It is *the* book *par excellence* on the whole subject.

Digitized by Google

ultimate destruction. The distinguished authors of that very remarkable book, "*The Unseen Universe*," Christians as well as philosophers, thus write:—"The tendency of heat is towards equalisation; heat is *par excellence* the communist of our universe, and it will, no doubt, ultimately bring the system to an end. This universe may in truth be compared to a vast heat engine. The sun is the furnace or source of high-temperature heat of our system, just as the stars are for other systems, and the energy which is essential to our existence is derived from the heat which the sun radiates, and represents only a small portion of that heat. But while the sun thus supplies us with energy he is himself getting colder, and must ultimately, by means of radiation into space, part with the life-sustaining power which he at present possesses. Besides the cooling of the sun we must also suppose that owing to something analogous to ethereal friction the earth and the other planets of our system will at length be engulfed in his mass. In each such case there will be, as the result of the collision, the conversion of visible energy into heat, and a partial and temporary restoration of the power of the sun. At length, however, this process will have come to an end. . . . Not much further need we dilate on this. It is absolutely certain that life, so far as it is physical, depends essentially upon transformation of energy; it is also absolutely certain that age after age the possibility of such transformation is becoming less and less; and, so far as we yet know, the final state of the present universe must be an aggregation (into one mass) of all the matter it contains, i.e. the potential energy gone, and a practically useless state of kinetic energy, i.e. uniform temperature throughout that mass. . . .

"The study of the necessary future has prepared us for an inquiry into the long remote past. Just as the present discrete stellar systems must finally come together, so the materials which now form them must have originally been widely separate. Our modern knowledge enables us to look back with almost certitude to the time when there was nothing but gravitating matter and its potential energy throughout the expanse of space—ready, as slight local differences of distribution predisposed it, to break up into portions, each converging to one or more nuclei of its own, and thus forming in time separate solar or stellar systems. We have thus reached the beginning as well as the end of the present visible universe, and have come to the conclusion that it began in time and will in time come to an end. IMMORTALITY IS THEREFORE IMPOSSIBLE IN SUCH A UNIVERSE."*

Such is the last word of science, and it is a word of doom. Science brings man to the grave, and having brought him there it can explain to us the chemical laws by which the organism—apart from which it knows nothing either of consciousness or personality—is sooner or later broken up and utterly dissolved: but it has no instruments delicate enough to detect a spiritual presence, if such there be; no light powerful enough to penetrate the solid darkness which lies beyond.

II. And this darkness, absolute on the physical side, has cast its awful shadow over the metaphysical region also, and for ever eclipsed those glimmering and uncertain lights by which men long endeavoured

* Pp. 90-93

Digitized by Google

to grope their way to the hope of immortality. For foremost among the arguments for immortality which REASON has been supposed to supply, stands that derived from the assumed simplicity and immateriality of the soul or principle of thought. This argument, adduced by Bishop Butler in his celebrated work, "The Analogy of Religion," and elaborated by Samuel Drew in his well known treatise, is now, *by the confession of Dr. Angus*, "generally abandoned as inconclusive."* And well it may be; for apart from the fact that it involves a conception of "soul" or "spirit" of which neither the Scriptures nor the older philosophies know anything; which is not only incapable of proof but opposed to such evidence as comparative physiology can afford, and is manifestly a mere *Deus ex machina* invented for the purpose it is supposed to serve;† Kant showed, long ago, that even if this immateriality of the human soul could be demonstrated, its immortality would not necessarily follow, since though "the soul could not perish by any diminution of its extensive quality, the argument from its simplicity did not exclude the possibility of its extinction through the gradual weakening of its forces and the successive relaxation of its intensive quantity." In other words, though the soul could not "melt like a streak of morning cloud into the infinite azure of the past," there would yet be nothing to prevent its dying like a vision of the night in the unconsciousness of a deeper slumber. Moreover, reason itself might surely teach us that nothing which has had a beginning can necessarily be unending. Spiritual or ethereal, if the soul *began* to be, so it may—perhaps *must*—*cease* to be, save by the will of God: necessary existence being predicable of One only. "This ought," it has been well said, "to be so obvious as to convince us that there must be a fallacy, whether we can detect it or not, in all such attempts to prove the immortality of the creature."

But this argument lies open to another objection which is at once very obvious and practically conclusive. The best authorities in comparative psychology are now sufficiently agreed that the mind of animals differs from the human mind not in quality but only in quantity; and it is impossible candidly to read such books as Watson's "*Reasoning Power in Animals*," and Wood's "*Man and Beast, Here and Hereafter*," as well as some very remarkable articles which have recently appeared in the "*Quarterly Journal of Science*," without being convinced that powers of reason, and even of conscience, are sometimes manifested by the nobler animals, such as the dog, the horse, and the elephant, in an astonishing manner. Hence, as Mr. White truly observes, "A few misquoted texts of Scripture can no longer avail to conceal the fact that a science of comparative psychology has sprung up, which shatters the metaphysical arguments on which hitherto theologians have rested their hope of life eternal. For if man's prospects in the future depend on the possession

---

* Notes on Butler's Analogy. R. T. S.

† KNAPP, in his "Christian Theology" writes:—"The fine-spun theories of immateriality were never resorted to by theologians to prove the immortality of the soul, or ascribed by them to the Bible, until Hobbes, Toland, De la Mettrie, and other materialists, had so perverted the doctrine of materialism as to deduce from it the destructibility of the soul, or its annihilation at the death of the body."

Digitized by Google

of mind, then he must either share this immortality with his animal neighbours, or consent to abandon his own expectation on that ground along with theirs. Whatever evidence there is that man possesses conscious intelligence, there is precisely equal evidence that it is possessed by them. The animals have real minds, cognisant of real ideas, and acting in various methods upon them. Mind is as varied in its developments as matter, though we know nothing of the nature of either. Whatever evidence there is that consciousness in man resides in an immaterial essence, there is the same evidence that it is immaterial in 'the beasts that perish.' If man's immateriality is to be made a basis for the argument of immortality, it must be extended logically over the whole area of life. The immortality of the animating principle of coral insects and amæbæ is the legitimate inference from its immaterial quality, if the same inference is insisted on in the example of man. The argument which is good for man is equally available for animalculæ and for all intermediate grades."* Bishop Butler perceived how inevitable was this inference, and boldly accepted it, but he wrote before the recognition of the great scientific law of Evolution, and did not see therefore that it was not merely the "immortality of brutes" which was involved, but logically that alike of the ephemera, dancing their few short hours in the sunshine, and of the most noxious insect; nay, since no clear distinction can any longer be drawn between the animal and vegetable kingdoms, the one gradually merging in the other, of the thistle, the scriptural evidence of earth's judicial barrenness, and the hyssop that springeth out of the wall. Now reason—the oracle to which appeal is made—teaches us at least this, that just in proportion to the immense importance and *prima facie* unlikelihood of the soul's immortality should be the strength of the arguments and evidences by which it is supported. Weak arguments can little help so great a cause; and hence the growing impatience of such "shams of the doctrine of immortality," as Mr. Haweis calls them, "which have waxen old and are ready to vanish away."

III. We turn then, in the third place, to another supposed source of proof on this question, namely, INSPIRATION; by inspiration here being understood, not the inspiration of the written Word, but that of the human spirit, or, as it has been otherwise expressed, "the voice of God within the soul." For though the voices of science and philosophy be ambiguous or even hostile, it is yet quite conceivable that God may have written the fact of its immortality, as by his own finger, upon the tablet of the human soul itself, and that he has in point of fact done so has long been and still is very confidently maintained. The arguments here are of two classes, and demand careful attention.

First, then, it is said: *Men of all nations and throughout all ages have believed in Immortality, and this faith being instinctive must have been divinely implanted*, for the instincts of humanity are the echoes of the voice of God.

Secondly. *The supposition of the moral government of the world by a Being of infinite power, holiness, and love, involves the conclusion that the startling and painful anomalies of this life will be redressed and adjusted*

* "*Life in Christ*," pp. 17, 18,

Digitized by Google

in a future state of existence. To deny any future retribution is virtually to deny the moral government of God; but if there is to be a future retribution there must of necessity be a future life for men.

Now as regards the former of these arguments we are equally prepared to admit that such a belief as that contended for, has in truth been almost co-extensive with the existence, geographically and chronologically, of the human race, or boldly to deny that it has any existence whatever, and challenge the proof thereof, *according to the definition which is given of the word "immortality"* in this connexion. For the fact is, that this precise and definite-looking word—about the lexical meaning of which there can be no question—has been so lubricated for more convenient controversial use, that unless we clearly understand in what sense it is used, it is apt to slip from between our fingers. If those who assert so confidently this world-wide belief in "immortality," intend thereby to affirm the existence of such a universal faith *in the absolutely unending life of all human souls* after death, then we must meet it by a simple denial that any such universal belief ever has existed, or does now exist, and we can point—as a single but overwhelming proof to the contrary—to Buddhism with its 480,000,000 of believers, the first principle of which wonderful religion is,—however much it may have been obscured by modern corruptions,—that the soul is *not* in this sense immortal, but that, on the contrary, individual existence is so great and terrible an evil that the furthest and most sublime hope which the awful future can present, is the eternal loss of conscious personal existence in the infinite nothingness of *Nirvana.* That any theologian of average intelligence and information should have the temerity to assert that "immortality," in this its lexical sense, is the universal instinct of humanity, when the greatest religion in the world in point of numbers—the religion we may say of one-third of our race—so emphatically denies it, would be strange and wonderful indeed, if the vast and indefinite limits of human credulity on the one hand, and of human assumption on the other, were not more strange and wonderful still.

If, however, what is meant by a universal belief in human immortality, is nothing more than the intuitive apprehension of *a future existence,* in the sense of the conscious survival of the soul-conditioned spirit, after the death of the body; then we are not only prepared, so far as we are concerned, to admit its existence, as established beyond all reasonable doubt or contradiction in such works as Professor Max Müller's "*Lectures on the Science of Religion,*" Sir John Lubbock's "*Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man;*" Tylor's "*Primitive Culture,*" and Alger's "*Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life;*" but we are furthermore quite disposed to regard it as a fact the psychological and theological importance of which can hardly be over-estimated. As we mark the manifold indications of its existence throughout many ages and among all peoples; and as we realise more fully its importance, not only as in many cases the only particular in which the human transcends the lower animal, but as in all supplying a natural basis on which the true and perfect hope of immortality in Christ may be built, we are constrained to recognise in it the tracing of God's own finger, faint indeed, but as indelible and authentic as in the words of the Law or the promises of the Gospel. At all events it is a fact which the Christian

Digitized by Google

psychologist is bound to accept and to account for; and a fact, it must be added, which standing in sharp and significant contrast with statements which have been hazarded by some materialistic theologians, to the effect that "the popular idea of an intermediate state of conscious existence after death is based upon the speculations of Platonic philosophy, and adopted by heathen and Christian poets as a fruitful field for the play of passion and imagination,"—proves such statements to be actually, however unintentionally, serious misrepresentations. Where the name of Plato was never heard; where no system of human philosophy could even be comprehended; where the light of Christ's Gospel has never shot one ray of heaven-born light athwart the moral night; in the lowest depths of primitive barbarism, and amid the most utter moral degradation of humanity, this instinctive belief—manifested in a thousand pitiable and fantastic forms; this indestructible conviction —indigenous to the otherwise barren soul of man; is found to exist. Nor *only there;* but upward through each ascending stage of mental and moral culture, into the midst of the highest civilisation to which man has yet attained, and even the clear sunlight of Christian faith and hope. It belongs to man, not to philosophy; it is the voice of God, not the poet's dream.*

Nevertheless, neither the admission of such an apprehension—for it is rather a terror than a consolation—nor the recognition of its true importance, really touches the question with which we are here concerned. With scarcely an exception this instinctive belief in a future existence, we cannot call it *life*, is found to take the form of *a deteriorated continuance of the present*, a mere soul-survival, a belief in apparitions; the thread of consciousness is never broken, the conception of a bodily resurrection is never reached, or at most very rarely; and above all, the question of *the duration of such future existence*—save in the speculations of Greek philosophy—is never raised.

This is proved by the fact that it has almost universally taken the direction of *the worship of ancestors*. "The worship of the spirits of the departed," says Professor Max Müller, "is perhaps the most widely spread form of natural superstition all over the world. It is important to observe that on this point, which has always been regarded as most characteristic of Chinese religion, there is no difference between China and Northern Asia. . . . Even those who do not profess belief in a future life observe certain ceremonies which show that they think of the

* "Philosophy," it has been truly said by an accomplished writer, "did not create the belief in immortality (i.e., a future life), and acknowledges or denies its validity just as it is or is not involved in its own fundamental principles. Speculative thought has said all that it can say against the belief, and it still lives; has said, too, all that it can say for it, and it has not died. The old arguments, metaphysical, ethical, teleological, have been exhausted, advanced, answered, confirmed, repelled, in almost every possible form, and now thought must turn from the high road of abstract speculation and study human belief as expressed in human religion. Religion, or rather its philosophic theology, may now become a science as purely inductive as any of the physical sciences. The now possible analysis of the faiths of the world, if accompanied by a searching analysis of the faculties of the mind, will hand over to thought our primary and necessary religious ideas, which, as ultimate religious truths, constitute in their synthesis the foundation of the universal and ideal religion of man."—A. M. FAIRBAIRN, "*Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History*," pp. 112, 113.

Digitized by Google

departed as still existing. Lapps and Finns admit that the body decays, but they imagine that a new body is given to the dead in the lower world. Others speak of the departed as ghosts or spirits, who either stay in the grave or in the realm of the dead, or who roam about on earth, particularly in the dead of night and during storm and rain."* The aborigines of California were as near beasts as men were ever found. The Roman Catholic missionaries likened them to "herds of swine, who neither worshipped the true and only God, nor adored false deities." Yet even they must have had some vague notion of an after life, for Baegert, who paints the darkest picture of their condition, remarks, "I saw them frequently putting shoes on the feet of the dead, which seems to indicate that they entertain the idea of a journey after death."† "One solitary testimony to a faith in mind," says Baron Bunsen, "is to be found among the Chinese, and that has survived the lapse of millenniums with their various religious systems, namely, THE WORSHIP OF THE DEAD. Among the Turanians and Aryans, perhaps, too, among the Semites, this is one of the elements out of which the mythological process takes its rise; among the Chinese it is their only mode of intercourse with the world of mind, their only link to personality."‡

This is a very different thing to a belief in "immortality," properly so called, though doubtless it is the germ out of which, by long intellectual culture, that philosophic conception is developed. The savage, generally speaking, realises more or less vividly the continued existence of his dead companions or parents but for a limited period; it is only those who have been distinguished by their physical or intellectual superiority—their virtues or their crimes—who secure for themselves a pseudo-immortality, simply because *their* memory is not confined to their own family or generation, but becomes the possession of the nation during successive generations. "While the instincts of the primitive mind refuse to conceive the dead as non-existent, a double incapacity prescribes the limits and form of the only conception possible to it,—the incapacity to conceive other than embodied being, and the incapacity to comprehend unlimited duration. In other words, the undeveloped mind cannot conceive the abstract notion of spirit, and the abstract notion of immortality, or endless duration of being. Hence the earliest notions of the future represent it as a shadowy copy of the present; and its duration is measured by memory, is not made measureless by hope—i.e., the conception attaches itself to the recollection of the dead rather than to the expectation of the living."§

"Ask the negro," says M. Du Chaillu, "'where is the spirit of his great-grandfather,' he says he does not know, 'it is done.' Ask him about the spirit of his father or brother who died yesterday, then he is full of fear and terror; he believes it to be generally near the place where the body has been buried, and among some tribes the village is removed immediately after the death of one of its inhabitants. The same belief prevails among the Amzulu Kaffirs, as has been well shown

* "Lectures on the Science of Religion," Lect. iii.
† Quoted by BRINTON, "Myths of the New World," p. 234.
‡ "God in History," vol. 1, p. 257.
§ A. M. Fairbairn, *ubi supra*.

Digitized by Google

by Mr. Callaway. They believe that the spirits of their deceased fathers and brothers still live, because they appear to them in dreams; by inverse reasoning, however, grandfathers are generally regarded as having ceased to exist."*

There is then, in this well nigh universal belief in the survival, for a period more or less protracted, of the souls or ghosts of the dead,—the significance and importance of which we have nevertheless fully acknowledged,—no basis for the assertion, still sometimes so rashly made, that "all men have believed in immortality." Ethnology, by a vast induction of facts, proves the very contrary to be true. And if it be said, as somewhat shallowly it has been said, that if we admit such a general belief in a future existence of the soul, we virtually admit its proper immortality, since we have no proof that existing beyond death it does not exist for ever; our answer is twofold, first, that we are not called upon to prove a negative, the *onus probandi* lying on the other side; and secondly, that this question, if thus confessedly an open one at best, must be left for decision to the only final authority which as Christians we acknowledge,—the testimony of the New Testament Scriptures, to which ground it is our special desire to confine the argument, if only the advocates of unconditional immortality are willing so to do.

When we turn to the second of the arguments which we have classed under the general head of inspiration, namely, that derived from the supposition of a moral government of the world, and the consequent moral necessity for a Divine retribution and adjustment of the wrongs and suffering inflicted and endured in this life, in other words what is commonly called "the moral argument" for immortality; we are brought face to face with one the *prima facie* value and strength of which far exceeds that of those we have already considered, either separately or together; and that just because it rests on moral rather than on philosophical or metaphysical grounds, and makes its appeal not to the intellect but the conscience. Hence we find that it is on this argument mainly, if not exclusively, that the Theists of the present day are disposed to build their hope of Immortality. By no writer of that school, perhaps, has it been presented with greater force and eloquence than by Miss Frances Power Cobbe, in her "*Hopes of the Human Race.*" Thus she writes: "Assuming that I address men and women who believe in God, and Justice, and Love, I proceed to endeavour to show how—even should they stand appalled by the difficulties of belief in immortality—they may yet oppose to those difficulties moral arguments so numerous and irrefragable, that the scale may well turn on the side of belief. I hope to show that by many different but converging lines, faith uniformly points to a life after death, and that if we follow her guidance in any one direction implicitly, we are invariably led to the same conclusion. Nay, more: I think it may be demonstrated that we cannot stop short of this culmination and afterwards retain intact our faith in anything beyond matters of sense and experience. Every idea we can form of justice, love, duty, is truncated and imperfect if we deny them the extension of eternity; and as for our conception of God, I see not how any one who has realised the 'riddle of the painful

* Sir John Lubbock, "*The Origin of Civilisation,*" pp. 138-9.

Digitized by Google

earth,' can henceforth call Him 'good,' unless he believe that the solution is yet to be given to that dark problem hereafter.

"There is one unendurable thought. It is, that justice may fail to be done in time or in eternity. This thought makes the human soul writhe like a trampled worm. Other ideas are sad, even agonising, but this cannot be borne. No courage, no virtue, no unselfishness, will help us to bear it. The better we are, the more insufferable it is. To receive it into the soul is madness. On the other hand, every threat besides, however sorrowful or terrible, if it be but overshadowed by the sense, 'It will be just,' becomes endurable—nay, is followed by a sort of awful calm. Could we even feel certain that our guilt merited eternal perdition, then the doom of hell would bring to us only dumb despair. Something greater than ourselves within us would say to the wailings of our self-pity, 'Peace! be still.' But let us only doubt that there is any justice here or hereafter, let us think that wrong and tyranny may be finally triumphant, and goodness and heroism ultimately defeated, punished and derided, and lo! there surges up from the very depths of our souls a high and stern remonstrance, an appeal which should make the hollow heavens resound with our indignation and rebellion."*

It is not without a feeling somewhat akin to compunction that we venture to assail an argument thus presented, and especially an argument which *from the writer's standpoint* is both sound and strong. Nevertheless a little consideration may serve to convince us of two things; first, that this argument is strong only on Theistic grounds,—to our mind the most unsatisfactory and unstable ground it is possible to occupy; and secondly, that it is no argument for immortality at all, in the only sense, i.e., the lexical, in which we here call that doctrine in question.

(1.) The strength of this moral argument for a future life is derived solely from a Theistic standpoint. Of course Christians are in the truest sense of the word, Theists; but we use the term here as designating those who, while rejecting Christianity, yet profess their belief in a God of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, On this assumption, —which assuredly, *apart from Christ*, "the riddle of the painful earth," as, e.g., the recent doings and sufferings in Bulgaria, does little to encourage,—doubtless the argument as far as it goes—and *how far* it does go we shall show presently—is unobjectionable; but as opposed to the scientific materialism of the day, which refuses to admit this assumption, it is as valueless as the most imposing array of ciphers from which the preceding numeral has been removed. Given—assumption the first as the scientist would say—the existence of a God of infinite power, justice, and love; and given also—assumption the second and still greater—that such a Being would create and suffer to continue such a system of things, physically, socially, and morally as this world has presented throughout its recorded history, and does still under its existing conditions present; and doubtless the argument holds good. But it rests, as we see, on a double assumption, the second of which is so precarious that its reflex action tends greatly to weaken the force of the

* Pp. 25-27.

Digitized by Google

argument, even as derived from the first. We may in a simple manner illustrate our meaning thus:—

Let us suppose that a traveller is passing through the dominions of a mighty monarch, who he is informed not only possesses absolute power and most efficient ministers, but who with a wisdom unparalleled and a beneficence the most boundless seeks continually to advance the prosperity and happiness of his subjects. Our traveller finds, nevertheless, that throughout the particular province of the empire in which he happens to be journeying, there everywhere exists extreme misery, cruel oppression, and preventable evils of a thousand kinds; but on expressing his astonishment and indignation at such a state of things, he is complacently told that all this, deplorable as it seems, only proves—under the government of so wise and gracious a sovereign—that these anomalies will at some future time and in some other province of the vast empire, to which these sufferers are to be removed, be completely redressed and adjusted. Would our hypothetical traveller be fairly bound under such circumstances, do we think, to accept this explanation as either satisfactory or sufficient? Surely not. "You tell me," he might rather say, "that your ruler is mighty, just, and good; but you admit that you have never seen this mysterious monarch, and that you do not in fact possess any promise that he will thus cause just recompense to be made. On the other hand, the actual condition of his people, in this part of his dominions at least, is a fact before my eyes, and one which it is impossible to reconcile with your account of his character and government; I am therefore forced to conclude that this monarch of yours, *if he exists at all*, lacks either the will or the power to secure the welfare and happiness of his subjects, and hence analogy leads me also to fear that much the same state of things would in all probability be found to exist throughout the whole of his empire and as long as his reign shall continue. You may, if you please, argue from the unseen and unknown to the seen and known; but I prefer to argue from the seen and known to to the unseen and unknown."

Christianity, no doubt has—to the satisfaction and assurance at least of millions—met and solved this great problem. The uplifted cross of a suffering Saviour has broken up, if it has not dissipated, the darkness of nature, and irradiated the mystery of pain with a glory which only through pain could be revealed. But it has done this in a manner and by means which quite set aside the moral argument for immortality, as uncalled for if not inadmissible. Christianity does not require its aid if indeed it can accept it. It bases its sublime revelation of *conditional immortality* on Divine facts, not on moral principles which owe their real power only to those facts. The world knows no true and living morality apart from the life and love of Christ, and man's only solid hope of immortality rests absolutely on the miracle of his resurrection. Plainly "the moral argument for immortality" was not in Paul's mind when he wrote: "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and *if Christ be not raised*, . . . then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ *are perished*." (1 Cor. xv. 16, 18.) "Perished!" the Theist may exclaim, "nay, Paul, you are overlooking 'the moral argument for immortality.' You forget that unless there be a future life in which compensation shall be made for wrong and suffering endured here, we

Digitized by Google

will 'make the hollow heavens resound with our indignation and rebellion.'" But we think Paul would answer, calmly and even sternly; "And the hollow heavens would reverberate the indignation and rebellion of a sinful and sentenced race, whose individual demands for retribution against their fellows would be as *immoral* as that of the debtor in the parable against his fellow servant who owed him an hundred pence. his own debt to the common master being ten thousand talents; and their claims to compensation for the wrongs and sufferings they have in this life endured as ludicrously out of place, as if a criminal condemned for a capital offence should claim compensation for the incommodiousness of the vehicle in which he is carried to execution."

(2.) But setting aside all this, and even accepting the "moral argument" on Theistic ground, it can easily be shown that it is really no argument at all for "immortality" in the lexical sense of "*endless* existence," however valid it may be—like that instinctive conviction of survival of which we have spoken—for a *future* existence. This point has been so well and forcibly put by one of the earlier writers in this controversy—Mr. H. H. Dobney of Maidstone,—whose valuable book, "*The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment*," has to the great regret of many been long out of print.*—that we prefer to give his words rather than any of our own: "The argument has merely to be stated in form, and then no one can be at a loss as to its real value. It stands thus:—

"The character of God ensures that he will reward virtue and punish vice.

"But in the present state this is not fully done,

"There remains therefore another state in which all shall be adjusted.

"Let this stand as good reasoning; and no one, it is believed, can wish to enlarge the conclusion, for the premises will not sustain a larger. How then does it prove that the next state must be unending, and that man is immortal? Surely something less than *eternity* would suffice to rectify all the anomalies of the threescore years and ten of the present state. For will any one maintain the proposition,—that nothing less than time infinitely protracted would be sufficient for this purpose? Only let an attempt be made to realise what is meant by the word so easily pronounced, ETERNITY! and let it be remembered that when we have exhausted all our powers of calculation, taxing the imagination to multiply all the atoms in the universe by themselves, each standing for millions of ages, and heaping up all the illustrations we can invent, till the mind sinks back exhausted and distracted, even then we have done nothing, literally nothing, towards gaining any idea of eternity; of which it is not possible for the human mind to form an idea, for how can the finite take in the infinite? No,—a *future state* may be shown to be not improbable, probable even in a high degree, but this is quite another thing from a proved immortality. And a future state protracted through ages that outnumber all the atoms of all worlds is after all infinitely short of immortality. This argument, then, when properly

* Nor can we now hope for its republication, the author having changed his views, and become avowedly a Universalist.

Digitized by Google

stated, can at the best do no more than support the doctrine of a future state, without bearing at all on the doctrine of immortality."*

We have thus, hastily indeed, but not carelessly, traversed the whole field of inquiry, apart from Scripture, from Dan even to Beersheba, and found it barren of any proof of immortality. We have interrogated the oracles, but alike in vain; science says, "It is not in me;" metaphysic says, "It is not with me;" even the inspiration of man's spirit and the voice of conscience can but respond, "We have heard the fame thereof with our ears." Hence nothing remains for us but to say, with one of the most able defenders of the doctrine of eternal torment,—"The *light of nature* can never scatter the darkness in question. This light has never yet sufficed to make even the question clear, to any portion of our benighted race, whether the soul of man is immortal? *Cicero*, incomparably the most able defender of the soul's immortality of which the heathen world can yet boast, very ingeniously confesses, that after all the arguments which he had adduced in order to confirm the doctrine in question, it so fell out, that his mind was satisfied of it only when directly employed in contemplating the arguments adduced in its favour. At all other times, he fell unconsciously into a state of doubt and darkness.

"It is notorious also that Socrates, the next most able advocate among the heathen for the same doctrine, has adduced arguments to establish the never-ceasing existence of the soul which will not bear the test of examination. Such is the argument by which he endeavours to prove, that we shall always continue to exist because we always have existed; and this last proposition he labours to establish, on the ground that all our present acquisitions of knowledge are only so many *reminiscences* of what we formerly knew, in a state of existence *antecedent* to our present one. Unhappy lot of philosophy, to be doomed to prop itself up with supports so weak and fragile as this! How can the soul be filled with consolation in prospect of death, without some better and more cheering light than can spring from such a source? How can it quench its thirst for immortality, by drinking in such impure and turbid streams as these? Poor wandering heathen! How true it is—and what a blessed truth it is—that 'life and immortality are brought to light in the Gospel!' It is equally true, that they are brought to light *only there*."†

IV. This testimony of an opponent—by no means a weak one—brings us to the threshold of SCRIPTURE, as the final as well as the only reliable source of information on this great question. Do then the Scriptures, more especially those of the New Testament, reveal the *unconditional* immortality of all men, or the *conditional* immortality of those who are "in Christ Jesus our Lord?" Into that question we do not enter now. On this, *its only true ground*,—the previous question which we have been considering being disposed of,—the battle has, during the past ten years, been fought again and again; and we may without undue assumption say, victory along the whole line so signally won, that we now see "orthodoxy" driven to adopt that always hazardous "strategic movement,"—an entire change of front. "The Bible does not reveal

* Second edition, pp. 97, 99. † MOSES STUART, "*Exegetical Essays*."

Digitized by Google

but it *assumes* the immortality of all men." This is the position now generally taken up. But surely we have a right to demand, On what grounds is this assumption made? It can hardly be that orthodoxy would do such dishonour to those inspired documents which it professes so deeply to revere, as to maintain that their teaching is based on an assumption at once gratuitous and groundless! Yet we have in this paper searched for any such ground in vain. Shall we ask, then, for some other and stronger evidence? That would be mere affectation since we know perfectly well that none such exists. We can, therefore, only regard this theory of "assumption" as a manœuvre—like the firing of cannon to cover, with the smoke, the retreat of a discomfited army—to postpone if it cannot prevent the humiliation of an unconditional surrender. But there is one surrender which involves no humiliation, though it needs humility; for he who, surrendering to the majesty of TRUTH, lays at the feet of the Divine Conqueror his frail and broken weapons, does in the very act become clothed upon with a heavenly armour which is at once the means and the assurance of everlasting victory.

Florence Villa, North Finchley, N. W. MAUDE.

"UNTIL HE COME."

AT this great light my lamp I trim,
Whilst waiting for the Lord;
Whate'er I doubt I doubt not Him,
But rest upon his word.

Until He come dark clouds will sail
Across the troubled sky,
And all creation send its wail,
By thousand tongues, on high.

Until He come earth's kings will find,
Amongst increasing fears,
The desperate task to rule mankind
More desperate grow with years.

Till then philosophers will teach,
In books of sceptic mode,
That intellect such heights may reach
As to dispense with God.

The Church, until He come, will fail
To heal her scattered fold,
And differing sects will still assail
Each other, as of old.

But when He comes will come a change,
Most glorious to behold,
The world and church he will arrange,
And bring the age of gold.

Digitized by Google

SIDE ISSUES.

HAVING considered the direct objections to the doctrine of Conditional Immortality, suggested by "Lex" in a former number, we proceed to the collateral questions, which are thought to require an answer before the main point can be regarded as settled. By referring to pp. 817-819, our readers will see that what these questions come to is —How and when is salvation attainable? Can it be obtained in this life by any, such as infants or heathen, who have not been brought by faith to the knowledge of God in Christ? Can it be obtained hereafter by those who fail to obtain it here?

Now first let us show, that however interesting and important such questions may be, they have absolutely no bearing whatever on the doctrine of Conditional Immortality. We urge against the orthodox that eternal life is the gift of God in Christ, and not the natural and inalienable possession of every human germ which reaches a certain stage of development. How can that position be affected by any question as to the when and how such a gift is actually bestowed? We urge against Universalists, that our Lord's words, "that he might give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him," absolutely bar the possibility of its being given to all,—unless "as many as thou hast given me" can mean —as many human germs as reach the requisite stage of development. How can this position be affected by any question as to whether all those who *have been* given to Christ, and *will* live for ever, must necessarily be brought to the knowledge of Christ in this life? Or, again, our Lord describes certain persons, who will be found on the earth at his second coming under the image of tares, that are bound in bundles to be burnt. How can the question, whether that means that they will go on burning for ever, that they will be burnt into wheat, or that they will be put out of existence, be affected by the further question, what constitutes any one a tare, and so exposes him to this eternal torture, purification, or destruction as the case may be? What will become of these "children of the wicked one," cannot surely depend upon whether A or B will be included amongst them. Yet these various points are often mixed up together in the most singular confusion. Even in the very article on which we are commenting it is asked, "Why should Universalism be regarded as the only alternative, if the doctrine of eternal misery and that of annihilation be alike rejected?" For two reasons. First, because every one must ultimately be either saved or lost; secondly, because every one who is lost must either be kept alive for ever in sin and misery, or perish. The triangle has only three points; and no human ingenuity can invent a fourth. This seems so plain that one marvels how the question could be asked. But the mystery is explained by the confusion of ideas betrayed in the words which immediately follow. "I cannot but say to myself, Why should the notion of a further probation, under conditions differing from those that now obtain, be considered incredible?" Why indeed? But what has that to do with the question? The probability at least of such a further probation is held both by some of those who believe the wages of sin to be death, and by some of those who believe it to be eternal misery: but they would all agree that, unless every one is sooner or later actually saved, some persons must

Digitized by Google

undergo one or other of those penalties; in other words that Universalism *is* the only alternative if eternal misery and destruction be alike rejected.

The same confusion appears in another passage, which, as it requires two distinct answers, we shall divide. "Do they hold that every man, who is not while on earth made a new creature in Christ Jesus, will at the day of judgment be sentenced to a more or less prolonged torment, terminating in utter destruction? or, do they suppose that the work of redeeming mercy not being limited to this world, men who have neglected or rejected the invitations of the Gospel in this life may in another and a future state have further opportunities of repentance and faith?" Why, some of them hold one of these opinions, and some the other. But they all agree—1st, That some will never be brought to repentance and faith either in this world or in the world to come; and 2nd, That those who are not will perish by the second death under circumstances more or less terrible, according to the extent of their guilt. How is the truth or falsity of these two propositions affected by the question, when any particular person's day of grace must necessarily cease? Are we to consider every doctrine as doubtful, the maintainers of which differ on some other doctrine closely connected with it? If so, no proposition in the world can be regarded as established, outside of the exact sciences.

But the writer adds,—"which opportunities, if improved, may secure them a happy existence, prolonged indefinitely, but not necessarily involving immortality?" We certainly are not aware of any one holding this view. For what would it come to? Why, that a sinner might be brought to repentance and faith, be saved by Christ, and enjoy for a long period the consciousness of God's favour, and yet perish everlastingly. To know God in Christ, we are told, ensures "eternal life," or, in other words, "necessarily involves immortality."

As an instance of the "miscellaneous hitting," which the confusion above mentioned leads to, we may quote a writer in the *Contemporary Review* for July, 1872, who pronounced the destructionist theory to be "hideous," and yet at the same time maintained that "it would become the Almighty to extinguish" irreclaimable offenders, "and not to continue them in an existence which would be a fruitless misery to themselves, and a contamination to all who came in contact with them." It is perfectly obvious from his whole argument that what he *meant* to call "hideous" was the idea that every one's final destiny is irrevocably fixed at the moment of death. Some destructionists, no doubt, hold this, as do some believers in eternal torment; but it is no necessary part of either view, and many persons on both sides of the question utterly repudiate it. So also a writer in the CHRISTIAN WORLD not long since spoke of the destructionist view as "that saddest theological speculation." Yet surely he does not agree with Mr. James Grant that it is sadder to think of an incorrigible evil-doer being put out of existence than to think of his being stereotyped for ever in a state of sin and misery—sadder to think of the universe being cleansed by the destruction of all who will not love God and his creatures than to think of its remaining polluted for ever. Whatever he did mean to call the "saddest theological speculation," I feel very confident that he did not mean to apply it to the doctrine of destruction in the last resort. And what I

Digitized by Google

am pleading for is that we should all endeavour to say exactly what we mean, and that when people describe some theory which they call "annihilation" (a thing, by the way, that no one on either side believes) as "hideous," "sad," "miserable," "dreary," and so forth, they should state exactly what is the doctrine which they so regard, and in comparison with what other doctrine they so regard it. At present we are often left in equal ignorance as to the particular object of the writer's aversion, and as to what he wishes to substitute for it. Does he recoil from the possibility of any human being who has been born alive ever perishing, or from the belief that all such will ultimately perish if they die without faith in Christ, or from any intermediate view? And what does he believe himself? That they will all be converted—certainly, or only probably? And if the latter, what does he think will become of those who are not?

It will be observed that we have here met these collateral questions on the broad platform of our common faith. They are beset by considerable difficulties, and to enter upon anything like a discussion of them would far surpass our present limits. We have only been endeavouring to "clear the ground," by showing that on no view of them whatever—whether they be answered affirmatively or negatively, or whether it be admitted that Scripture supplies no positive answer to them at all—do they throw any doubt on the plain simple truth of Conditional Immortality. But the writer of this article may perhaps be allowed, without committing any one else, to give the following brief statement of his own views from a letter which appeared some time ago in the *Christian World*:—

"1. The most clearly revealed, and incomparably the most important, fact in the future of the universe I hold to be the entire and everlasting cessation of evil—'God all in all.' The salvation of any number of individuals, human or otherwise, is absolutely insignificant by the side of this grand ultimate fact. I would infinitely rather be assured of it than of my own personal immortality. 2. With scarcely less clearness does it appear to me to be revealed that this reconciliation of the universe will not be accomplished until after the destruction of those who persist in rejecting the counsel of God against themselves. In other words, I believe that God will be all (things) in all (persons)—not who have ever existed—but who then exist or shall thereafter exist. 3. I feel fully persuaded from the general tone of the New Testament, as well as from some of its positive declarations, that Divine grace may be sinned against in this life to such an extent that in those cases there remaineth no more possibility of repentance, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall (not purify, but) devour the adversaries. 4. On the other hand, with the plain declaration of St. Peter, which no ingenuity can get over, that the Gospel was, once at least, preached to the dead, I cannot but hope that in some cases it is so still. I confess to feeling very much staggered by the almost total absence of anything in the new Testament to confirm the inference from that isolated passage. But there the statement is; and the more closely it is examined the more impossible it seems to give it any other meaning. On the whole, I am inclined to think that it must have been intended to comfort believers by showing that the Gospel offer is not in every case necessarily

Digitized by Google

final; while the general silence of Scripture on any hope of salvation beyond the grave is a very solemn warning to unbelievers of their extreme peril. 'What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law.' The Bible speaks *to* men, rather than *of* them."

SAMUEL MINTON.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY IN AMERICA.

OF the multitudes who heard the address of Professor Huxley before the Johns Hopkins University, and of the other multitudes who will read it, all will unite in admiring the clearness and simplicity of his statements, the depth and grasp of his investigations into physical and intellectual education, and the earnestness of his convictions on the whole subject before him. But there are some, at least, of this number who will be apt to think it was not alone for these merits that the address was remarkable.

It was remarkable for what he did not say—for what he left unsaid on an occasion and with a subject before him which called for other and further utterances, without which his speech resembles the tongue without language, eyes without light, ears without sound—in short, a body without a soul. The address was a skeleton of very artistic anatomy, but still only a skeleton, for it lacked the power, energy, warmth, and motion of real life. To borrow one of his own illustrations—he made a desert and called it peace,—we may say of this address on the education of man, he makes a manikin and calls it a man.

It requires a bold man, even in this age of free inquiry, to define the true and wise education for man, embracing the whole arena of the school and the university, and yet to venture utterly to discard and ignore all training of his moral sentiments, of his responsibilities to a Supreme Being, of his religious nature, instincts, and convictions. Yet such is Professor Huxley's programme; such his curriculum of a full, complete university education, which he entitles "a fortress of the higher life of the nation"—a man without God; a ship on a stormy, rock-bound coast without a rudder; a drawn sword in the hand of a maniac. Experience and observation alike concur in the conclusion that without the purifying and restraining influence of the religious principle all the universities in the earth can never truly educate one man.

Would the Professor have us ignore or suppress all sense of the being and attributes of God, and of our duties and responsibilities to him? If such a thing were possible, it would be most illogical and unwise, for even Voltaire said: "If there were no God, we should have to invent one."

Perhaps Professor Huxley's defenders would reply to such obvious criticism: "He was not expected or invited to give us any utterances on religion, as a topic; that the religious training of students must be the work of parents at home, or of the church and its teachers, and therefore was not within his horizon." If such be really his sentiments, why did he not say so, if no more, and that would have conveyed his homage to the necessity and value of such training, as a part of every man's true education; but this significant silence, the failure to say even so little, on an occasion which properly called for it, argues his

Digitized by Google

disbelief in the religious idea, and a disparagement of religious faith as a factor of any worth or power in education.

It is observable that in the address the word God does not appear. Twice he speaks of fate, once of fortune, and once of providence, glittering phrases that do not mean anything definite or descriptive of the Bible faith, but mere terms borrowed from the creed of paganism. Perhaps Mr. Huxley agrees with Pope:

> "Know then thyself: presume not God to scan;
> The proper study of mankind is man."

He, too, may consider it presumptuous to scan God, yet the patriarch Job, who as scientist and philosopher is not a whit behind our professor, taught a different and far more rational creed when he said: "Acquaint thyself with God." And so too, the prophet Jeremiah delivers this oracle from the divine wisdom: "Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might; let not the rich man glory in his riches, but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord, which exercise loving kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth. For in these things I delight, saith the Lord." And the Great Teacher sent from God declares: "This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."

It is easy to foresee the mischievous effect on the suspectible minds of young students of Professor Huxley's obvious distrust and indirect rejection of the religion of the Bible as an element of power and efficacy in the education of man. Other solecisms in what he claims to be the true wisdom could be easily pointed out, but the limits of a newspaper article forbid details. Of these we should not overlook the bold sophisms contained in such passages as these: Speaking of the school education, he says: "If an average boy of fifteen be able to read and write his own language with ease and accuracy, and with a sense of literary excellence derived from the study of our classic writers; with a general acquaintance with the history of his own country and with the great laws of social existence, supposing him to have acquired the rudiments of physical science, and a fair knowledge of elementary arithmetic and geometry, an acquaintance with logic rather by example than by precept, the elements of music and drawing, I venture to maintain the proposition that a young person educated thus far has a liberal, though perhaps not a full, education. It is liberal in breadth, it extends over the whole ground of things to be known and of faculties to be trained, and it gives equal importance to the two great sides of human activity, art and science."

What scope is afforded in this definition (as covering the whole ground of things to be known, and faculties to be trained) for the culture of ethics—the sense of right and wrong—of good and evil—to say nothing of religion?

Again he says: "So sure as it is that man lives not by bread, but by ideas, so sure is it that the future of the world lies in the hands of those who are able to carry the interpretation of nature a step farther than their predecessors—that another centenary will find our country grown to two hundred millions of English speaking people."

Digitized by Google

Professor Huxley evidently belongs to that small exclusive class in philosophy (falsely so-called) who fancy what mankind possess in themselves, *proprio vigo*, a secret means in their wisdom, and by their science, of rectifying the world's disorders, and perpetuating the present status of existence. Such men fail to recognise the fact that the present *kosmos* (world) is not a finality, but only a means to an end: that mankind live under a government now which is only provisional, not permanent; that its days are reckoned and numbered, and are being rapidly exhausted, when the conduct of human affairs, social and scientific, political, civil, and ecclesiastical, as at present constituted, will pass into other and wiser and immortal hands, under the rule of the King of saints, and His associates. Such is the cherished creed of all intelligent Christians; but men who, like our professor, are ignorant and faithless of this truth, and of the coming overthrow of the present powers that be, whom God permits to rule, and has even "ordained" as a temporary expedient until the rightful Ruler of this earth and its people shall appear, and claim His supreme rights, may naturally enough decry a divine interposition which will supersede their wisdom by His, which is alone competent to rule the world of mankind. No wonder they believe not, nor read, nor heed God's word, which plainly proclaims their utter and speedy confusion and overthrow. These are the prophets of peace of the latter days, the optimists of the universities and schools of science, whose vain imaginings are described in the second Psalm, and other Scriptures, and whose pagan colleagues St. Paul confounded at Athens, as recorded in Acts, chapter xvii., to which the reader is referred.—*Baltimore Gazette.*

THE ALTERED MOTTO.

OH, the bitter shame and sorrow
That a time could ever be,
When I let the Saviour's pity
Plead in vain, and proudly answered,
"All of self, and none of thee."

Yet he found me; I beheld him
Bleeding on the accursed tree,
Heard him pray, "Forgive them, Father!"
And my wistful heart said faintly,
"Some of self, and some of thee."

Day by day his tender mercy,
Healing, helping, full and free,
Sweet and strong, and ah! so patient,
Brought me lower, while I whispered,
"Less of self, and more of thee."

Higher than the highest heavens,
Deeper than the deepest sea,
Lord, thy love at last hath conquered;
Grant me now my soul's desire—
"None of self, and all of thee." MONOD.

Digitized by Google

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CITIES OF BASHAN.

DEAR SIR,—In reference to a pamphlet lately issued, entitled, "New Light on the Eastern Question,"—reviewed and extracted from in the October number of "THE RAINBOW," I would beg to submit to the consideration of your readers the interesting, if not remarkable, coincidence existing between the proposed re-possession, by the Jewish people of the country of Syria—as their divinely covenanted, rightful territory—put forth in that pamphlet, and the following statements of fact, recorded by Rev. J. L. Porter, of Belfast, in his valuble work of Oriental Travels, published some nine or ten years since, entitled, "The Giant Cities of Bashan, and Syria's Holy Places." In relation to the passage, Deut. iii. 3, 5, 14, Mr. P. writes:—

"In Argob, one of the little provinces of the kingdom of Bashan, there are no fewer than sixty great cities; fenced with high walls, gates, and bars; besides unwalled towns a great many." "Such a statement seems all but incredible. It would not stand the arithmetic of Bishop Colenso for a moment. Often, when reading the passage, I used to think that some strange statistical mystery hung over it; for, how could a province measuring not more than thirty miles by twenty, support such a number of fortified cities; especially when the greater part of it was a wilderness of rocks? But, mysterious, incredible as this seemed—on the spot—with my own eyes—I have seen that it is literally true. The cities are there to this day. Some of them retain the ancient names recorded in the Bible. The state of Bashan is, literally, crowded with towns and villages; and though the vast majority of them are deserted, they are not ruined. I have, more than once, entered a deserted city in the evening; taken possession of a comfortable house; and spent the night in peace. Many of the houses in the ancient cities of Bashan, are perfect, as if only finished yesterday. The walls are sound; the roofs unbroken; the doors, and even the window-shutters, in their places. Let not my readers think that I am transcribing a passage from 'The Arabian Nights.' I am relating sober facts. I am simply telling what I have seen—and what I purpose more fully to describe. 'But how,' you ask me, 'can we account for the preservation of ordinary dwellings in a land of ruins? If one of our modern English cities were deserted for (even) a thousand years, there would scarcely be a fragment of a wall standing.' The reply is easy enough.—The houses of Bashan are not ordinary houses; their walls are from five to eight feet thick; built of large square blocks of stone. The roofs are formed of the same material; hewn like planks, and reaching from wall to wall. The very doors and window-shutters are of stone, hung upon pivots projecting above and below. Some of these ancient cities have from two hundred to five hundred houses still perfect; but not a man to dwell in them."

Does it not appear, from the foregoing statements, set forth on reliable authority, that a place is already prepared in, at least, a portion of the promised inheritance, for the people of his inheritance who is "the Mighty God of Jacob?"

Yours, dear Sir, very sincerely,

Lee. J. H.

Digitized by Google

"DISCOVERED" OR "BURNED UP."

2 PETER iii. 10.

DEAR SIR,—Your correspondent "Clement" is right in supposing that the word "discovered" in my translation represents the text of Tregelles, which in this place has "εὑρεθήσεται."

This reading seems to have been adopted with some confidence by Dr. T., seeing that he does *not*, in this instance, as in some places, give an "alternative reading" in the margin as possessing nearly equal claims with that placed in the text.

As, however, this able textual critic uniformly gives, in his notes, any available evidence *against* as well as *for* the reading he adopts, we are able to state the results of his researches in this instance.

It appears, then, that although Dr. Tregelles has unhesitatingly preferred the reading named above, yet he found other readings sustained by ancient—though not the *most* ancient—witnesses. Substituting the names of the Codices for the letters by which they are known among scholars and adding their dates the evidence may be summarised thus:—

First—ευρεθησεται ("shall be discovered," or "found"):—Vatican MS., IV. CENT.; Sinai. IV. CENT.; Moscow, IX. CENT.; sustained by the following ancient versions,—the Bodleian Syriac, the Harleian Syriac (*margin*), the Thebaic, and the Armenian.*

Second—αφανισθησονται ("shall vanish"):—Ephraim MS., V. CENT.

Third—κατακαησεται ("shall be burned up"):—Alexandrian, V. CENT.; sustained by Codex Colbertinus, IMPT. CURSIVE OF XI. CENT.; Codex Passionei, ONE OF THE LATER UNCIALS, IX. CENT., and the following versions,—the Clementine Vulgate, the Harleian Syriac (*text*), the Memphitic, and the Æthiopic.

Fourth—καταησεται (? "shall be violently tossed"):—Codex Leicestrensis, XIV. CENT. [Is this a mere clerical error for the previous reading, by the omission of two letters, thus: κατα[κα]ησεται? J. B. R.]

It should be added that Jerome's Latin version, according to Codex Amiatinus, VI. CENT., is wholly without the final clause of this verse.†

Leaving these critical details for "Clement" and others—more competent than I can pretend to be—to deal with, for my own part I must in the meantime beg to fall back on the fact that Tregelles, with the two most venerable Greek copies to sustain him, has given the "first" of the above readings as at least most nearly approximating to the sentence as it fell from the pen of the sacred writer.

It occasions me no surprise that "Clement" should regard "shall be discovered" or "found" as a "hard" reading. I remember my own surprise when I first came upon it. Mindful, however, of the well-known dictum, *Prefer the harder reading*, I looked narrowly to see whether this hard one was not after all much to be preferred. I thought I saw something. I imagined I saw earth's wondrous frame laid open, her internal forces disclosed, &c. And then, with more pru-

* To these Tregelles adds: "(Præm. 'non' Bdl. Theb.)" Not feeling sure what importance to attach to this, I give it as I find it.

† The "Speculum of Augustine" has the following: "Et terra et ea quæ in ipsa opera omnia eorum omnium pereuntium, qualia debent edere exsecrabilibus escis et impietatibus, non expectantes præsentiam diei Domini."

Digitized by Google

dence, I concluded that my feeble powers of exegetical divination could be no law for others. In any case, if "Clement" will tell us what he can see by looking again, he may rely on a most respectful hearing from

Yours very truly,
JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

Literature.

Das Kommen des Herrn fur die Seinen, &c. (The Coming of the Lord for his Own. Essays to promote the knowledge and attaining of the near and great object of hope for those who believe in Christ.) By William Rheinland. Part I. Frankfort-on-the-Maine: H. L. Brönner.

IN this preliminary portion of his work, the author, who writes under a pseudonym, does not develope the whole of his argument. His first essay, "The Promise," quotes and comments upon a selection of texts in which the Saviour promises future manifestations of himself, or, in which the apostles express similar ideas. The second essay is on "The Duty of Watching and Waiting for the Lord." The third is on "The Evil Results of not Watching and Waiting for the Lord's Coming;" and the fourth is on "The Right Method of Waiting for the Lord." The coming of Christ, it is maintained, will be a real and visible coming, and the Lord will appear personally to gather and glorify his people. The temper in which he should be expected, and the qualifications required of those who would joyfully greet him, are fully described. The author is particularly urgent upon the duty of a living faith and vital godliness; and insists upon the duty of preparing in every right way for the great manifestation of Christ. He also depicts in vivid language the advantages which the righteous will enjoy. It is evident that in this pamphlet, we have only the basis for further explanations and arguments. The manner of the writer is earnest, warm-hearted, and persuasive. In the third essay, the evils which have resulted from the churches neglecting the great duty which the author enforces are powerfully described.

Hoffnungs-Lieder eines auf das Kommen des Herrn Wartenden. (Songs of Hope; by one who awaits the Lord's Coming.) Basel: C. F. Spittler.

THIS little book contains forty poetical pieces, headed by as many texts, and expressive of the desires and hopes of one who looks for better days to come. The nature of the topics may be inferred from the titles of the first few compositions:—"The Sabbath of God;" "Come, Lord Jesus;" "The Patience and Faith of the Saints;" "Joseph and Benjamin;" "Prayer and Conflict;" "The Supper of the Lamb;" "The Lord's last Knock." The poems are written in a devout and scriptural tone, and are altogether in accordance with the general title. The author everywhere breathes a spirit of earnest and anxious waiting for times of glory and blessedness, which he believes the Lord's people are to see. The coming of Christ is, of course, a prominent idea, and around it are clustered all those bright imaginings and expectations which are in accordance with that idea. The earnest breathings after holiness, and for the true glory of the Saviour, are admirably adapted to excite the warmest and best emotions of the Christian's heart. Some of the pieces are very grace-

Digitized by Google

fully written, and all of them will be read with pleasure by those among the disciples of Jesus who can read the language in which they are written.

A Narrative of the Proceedings of a Great Council of Jews, assembled in the plain of Ageda in Hungaria, about thirty leagues distant from Buda, to examine the Scriptures concerning Christ; on the 12th of October 1650. By Samuel Brett there present. Printed at London for Richard Moon at the Seven Stars in Paul's Church-Yard, near the great north door, 1655. (Price 3d.) London: Longmans & Co.

A COPY of Samuel Brett's narrative is preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. From this a reprint has been taken, without altering spelling or punctuation, and without curtailing passages which might have been left out. It is a curious and interesting pamphlet. It is an old witness to the well-known fact, that the Jews will never become Christians so long as popish idolatry calls itself Christian. As far as its influence extends, popery has been the bane of both Jew and Gentile. Woe unto it!

The Veil lifted from Israel. By T. K. De Verdon. London: Partridge.

THE object of this book is to show that the Anglo-Saxons are of Israelitish origin, the representatives of the so-called "lost" ten tribes; which, in fact, so far from being lost are the most powerful nation in the world, whose colonies are filling the earth, and causing the desolate places to bloom as the rose.

NOTICES.

"A. JONES."—Incidental proofs of our Lord's divinity are of frequent occurrence. Eph. iii. 19 is one that the thoughtful reader cannot overlook. If Christ be only man how could all believers be filled up to all the fulness of God, by the knowledge of his love? Water rises to its level, but no higher. No effect exceeds its cause. In the higher properties of Christ's love it surpasses knowledge; its strength and results are beyond our mental grasp. This fact, of itself, implies the superhuman; but then, what we *can* know of it fills us with the fulness of God; *therefore*, Christ is divine.

A GENTLEMAN in Madras writes:—"I have often wished to thank you for the peace and comfort I have enjoyed since I became acquainted with you through the RAINBOW. The doctrines you teach staggered me at first, but now I see how *true* they are, and wonder that I did not see this before. I thank our dear Lord for enabling me to believe the truth, and for putting it into your heart, and the hearts of others, to publish these things for the good of men. You will never know in this life the great good your RAINBOW has done and is still doing. I pray God to bless and prosper you, and to spare you many years for the great work in which you are engaged.

A LADY writes:—"I wish to express my sincerest thanks for the light on many important points of Scripture the RAINBOW has given me. I more and more appreciate its teaching. It has helped me to understand and love the Bible. In fact, it has made it a new Book to me. If my testimony to the peace and comfort of the doctrine of Life only in Christ

Digitized by Google

can, in any way, encourage you, I shall be truly glad. I am heartily thankful that I ever met with the RAINBOW. It has helped me to bear many trials more patiently."

H. MURRAY, 5, Hyde-street, Bloomsbury, writes:—"Sometime ago I withdrew from a Young Men's Bible Class where the theories of men were taught instead of the Word of God. Since then, I have been seeking for some meeting, where those desirous of learning the truth should be able to express their thoughts, and earnestly inquire into what the Scriptures teach, but find none in this neighbourhood. Thinking there may be other young men similarly circumstanced, who would be glad to meet over the Scriptures on Sunday afternoon, or any other time that might be arranged, I write to say that I shall be glad to hear from them. Should a sufficient number of names be received to commence with; notice will be given in the RAINBOW. I desire that, as young men, we may feel what it is to 'be strong,' and have the 'Word of God abiding in us.'"

W. J. HOBSON, M.A.—We are sorry that the length of your letter compels its exclusion this month, especially as the Christmas holidays made it necessary to furnish copy very early. It will appear in February.

"E. C. P." wishes to tender thanks to the gentleman who sends him the RAINBOW, and says, "I will not only read it myself, but will lend it out and make it more generally known."

AN AUSTRALIAN correspondent writes:—"I hope the RAINBOW will continne long to be published, and to be edited by you. It is now read by many who at one time would not touch it. It is meat and drink to me, and again I thank you for it."

A GENTLEMAN in Switzerland writes:—"With deep interest and great spiritual profit I peruse your estimable periodical, the RAINBOW. Particularly I am well pleased with your testimonies to the coming of our blessed Lord, and immortality only in him, in connection with the refutation of the dogma of endless pains in hell."

"J. C." says:—"I thank you for your profitable and interesting Magazine. There is none to equal it."

"J. F." writes:—"I owe you a deep debt for the precious truths you have put forth in the RAINBOW this year. I pray that you may be able to continue the same work and labour of love until the return of our MASTER." This correspondent kindly sent us a Post-office order, which enables us to post the Magazine to several persons who wish to have it, but are unable to pay for it. The following note is a specimen, and our brother "J. F." will be glad to see that he is the means of cheering such hearts:—"It is with the *greatest* regret that under the force of circumstances, I must give up the RAINBOW for the ensuing year. Its doctrines have been to me a *light* and the rejoicing of my heart. It will be a great *privation not to have the Magazine*, but we must yield to circumstances." We take this opportunity of adding, that our free list is a long one, and that any friends who choose to help us in this matter, will understand that they are sending loved truths to some who, though poor in this world, are rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to those that love him. Such helpers will, therefore, feel that they are amply rewarded.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

FEBRUARY, 1877.

MODERN UNBELIEF.

I.—ITS PREVALENCE.

THE Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Dr. Ellicott, has recently been engaged in his triennial visitation of the important Archdeaconry of Gloucester. Beginning at the cathedral city, he thence proceeded to five of the most important towns, delivering an elaborate charge, in a series of six sections, on the subject of "Modern Unbelief." Anything on such a subject, coming from one occupying a position so favourable for extensive observation, and possessing a mind so thoughtful and judicious as Dr. Ellicott, may well claim some special attention. The arrangement of the particular topics discussed, and their general treatment, may be briefly indicated.

In Section I., the *Prevalence of Unbelief* was considered. Referring to a charge in which, twelve years ago, he had "ventured to point out ominous signs of that frightful development of anti-christian error which is summed up not only in the denial of the Son but of the Father;" and "to call serious attention to the nature of the current speculations of those times, as suggesting the gradual approach of man's last and worst denial,—the denial of the personality of his Maker, and of the adorable Fatherhood of God;" the Bishop asserted that since then there had been no change for the better, but that, "as we well know, the true state of the case is utterly the reverse." Infidelity was assuming new forms and a more earnest tone; it was claiming to rest not on metaphysical speculation, or historical criticism only, but on facts and on science: and it was becoming popularly known and "even popularly accepted."

Section II., dealt with the *Causes of Unbelief*. It was asked, "To what causes or influences can we probably ascribe the apparent prevalence of suspended belief, and the increase of the difficulties in heartily accepting the facts and teaching of Christianity?" In

Digitized by Google

reply, three "of the many causes which may be assigned" received especial consideration. 1st, The tone and direction of recent historical criticism; 2nd, The deductions that have been drawn from the real or alleged discoveries of modern science; and 3rd, The moral and metaphysical difficulties which have been supposed to be involved in or connected with the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

Of Section III., the *Characteristics of Modern Unbelief* formed the subject. Pantheism and its cognate conception Cosmic Theism, or "Paratheism,"—the acknowledgment of an unknown and unknowable power, but not of the personality of God; and Atheism, were severally noticed.

In Section IV., the Bishop proceeded to point out the *Leading Arguments against Modern Infidelity*, "which were likely to tell most persuasively." Three were prominently presented: 1st, "That the truest science is unmistakably declaring *for* the truth of Theism, and *for* the belief in a Creator and Moral Governor. 2nd, That the various forms of infidelity are, and are felt to be, so ultimately incompatible with each other that scarcely any modern thinker cares to maintain any one of them in its separate individuality and distinctness. 3rd, That all these systems not only utterly fail to supply any answer to the grave moral difficulties which every day's experience brings before us, but also tend to weaken or suppress our higher aspirations.

In Section V. were set forth the *Leading Arguments for Christianity*, in reply to the question, "What are the chief positive arguments which, if we were suddenly asked why we are Christians, we should put forward with the fullest and clearest confidence?" The first was said to be based on the fact "that the broad statements of Scripture in respect of the physical history of the world are marvellously coincident with the best and most tested results of modern science." The second rested upon the truth "that Christianity is the only religious system in the world that gives a consistent account of the moral meaning and purpose of man's existence on the earth, and supplies an adequate answer to all deeper questions." The third, "the most completely heart-argument of all," was found in "the correlative nature of Christianity to all the higher aspirations and deepest needs of the human heart."

In the concluding section the Bishop spoke of the *Best Methods of dealing with Unbelief*. Reference was again made to Agnosticism or Nescience, as that most prevalent form of unbelief which accepts "nothing except what can be definitely proved, and regards every thing else as opinionable;" and as the form with which the address would chiefly deal with a view "to countervail its dangerous and dreadful influences." The selfishness and unreasonableness of standing aloof from the whole controversy, and "taking the position of those who rest principally on authority and dogmatic tradition," was plainly pointed out and rebuked. The clergy were

Digitized by Google

exhorted to "bear their part earnestly and bravely in the dread controversy hourly deepening around us," and to do so with "a feeling of cheerfulness and confidence." The possession and manifestation of sympathy with doubting and unhappy hearts was eloquently enjoined; humility and candour in setting forth truth, and the cultivation of necessary learning and knowledge were earnestly enforced.

Such a charge was not likely to escape comment and criticism: nor is it a matter for surprise that it has received it to a considerable extent. No one has denied the eloquence, candour, and general ability with which the subject is discussed; but there are those who question whether it should have been discussed at all; while others, admitting its grave importance, yet maintain that the Bishop's views, especially as to the *prevalence of unbelief*, are exaggerated, and his fears of its influence too deeply gloomy. A local journal in a generally appreciative article, yet expresses the opinion that "the Bishop has somewhat exaggerated the scepticism of the age;" and thinks he is misled by the freedom with which views formerly kept secret are now openly expressed, owing to a growing liberality in religious matters; and a well-known religious newspaper describes him as "a Bishop in the dumps," and speaks of his "gloomy sentences," and "lamentations."

By others our eyes are directed to certain facts in which Christianity appears to be going forth "conquering, and to conquer." It is asked, and that too with no small air of triumph,—Are not churches and chapels rising on every hand, and ministers, missionaries, and evangelists increasing in number, and working in city, town, and hamlet? Have we not revival services, parish missions, and house to house visitations? Is not religious instruction, in week-day and Sunday schools, being imparted to hundreds of thousands of young minds? Was there ever a time when the Scriptures were so widely diffused among all classes, and so generally read? Are not religious tracts scattered by the million annually; and do not religious periodicals issue in shoals from the press? Have not lecturers against infidelity been going up and down in the land; and has not Christian Evidence literature been rendered cheap and popular? In a word, are not Christian agencies more varied, more extensive, more active, and more liberally supported, than in any previous period of the church's history? How then can any one, knowing all these things, as Dr. Ellicott assuredly does, tell us that infidelity is becoming more popularly known and even more popularly accepted; growing bolder in its speech and more prevalent in its influence?

There are those, however, who think that on this particular point, the Bishop's views are in accordance with facts. Two or three years ago a shrewd literary man, having large opportunities for observation, remarked in private conversation with a friend, that ministers of the Gospel were living in a fool's paradise as to the

Digitized by Google

regard of the working classes for Christianity. *He*, for one, would not be likely to deride the vision which sees so plainly the thorns and briers and deadly plants that are growing and spreading in this imaginary Eden. At the Conference on Conditional Immortality, held at the Cannon Street Hotel, London, in May, 1876, the Rev. Edward White said, "An awful darkness, spite of optimist assertions to the contrary, is slowly settling upon the most interesting part of European society. Men in multitudes are losing their faith in natural immortality, and with that their faith in revelation. Revelation has hitherto been represented as resting on the pre-supposition of the immortality of the soul, and now that that foundation is giving way, faith in revelation is widely giving way too. The grand and awful vision of an eternal glory in the future, whether for some or for all, is vanishing from before the minds of millions. This scientific dissolution of faith is going on much more rapidly on the Continent than in England; but very rapidly among educated men even here. That there is no future state for men is a philosophy talked even at Oxford much more freely both by young and old than would be believed by the public."

The Rev. J. B. Heard, the author of that valuable work, "The Tripartite Nature of Man," whose opportunities for becoming acquainted with the real state of religious opinion in this country have been unusually extensive, subsequently, at the same meeting, observed: "My friend, Mr. Edward White, has said that there is a strong current of infidelity in our land. I marked that; and applauded most emphatically his expression with regard to Oxford. I have reason to know it with great sorrow that the young men of Oxford are rapidly slipping into unbelief. And I say to you parents, that you ought to consider this fact in sending your sons to universities, particularly to Oxford. It is a hotbed of reactionary theology, and *for that reason a hotbed of scepticism.*"

The late Chaplain-General of Her Majesty's Forces, the Rev. G. R. Gleig, in a recent work, writes thus: "It would be idle to shut our eyes to the fact, that in all the countries of Europe, and nowhere more strikingly than in our own, a change has passed, or is passing, over the minds of the educated classes, especially among the young, on the most important of all subjects. Old religious beliefs appear to be losing their hold on men's convictions, and nothing is brought forward to supply their place which seems capable of filling the void left thereby in the human heart. This is owing, no doubt, in part at least, to the misuse that has been made of the discoveries of modern science."*

It was only a few weeks before the delivery of Bishop Ellicott's charge, that Mr. Henry Dunn published locally some letters on "Christian Work and our Christian Condition," and his melancholy testimony relative to Sunday-school scholars and teachers

*"The Great Problem: Can it be Solved?" Edinburgh: Blackwood.

Digitized by Google

not only supports the Bishop's statements, but is so important and weighty in reference to certain aspects of the painful subject that I should quote whole paragraphs had I not the satisfaction of knowing that the readers of the RAINBOW will have the opportunity of reading his remarks *in extenso*.*

These must be admitted to be very serious testimonies, and one largely confirmatory of the Bishop's judgment; and my own observation would lead me to be a witness on the same side. From much which I have seen and known, my conviction is that there is a wide-spread leaven of unbelief among our more intelligent artisans and mechanics. The men who are accustomed to read the daily papers, attend public meetings, discuss the proceedings of Parliament, and take an interest in the social and scientific questions of the day, are not, as a rule, students of the Bible; nor even readers of its pages and believers in its teaching. The very opposite may, from a variety of facts, be inferred to be the case. Much of the literature most popular among this class has an infidel tone and tendency; many of their favourite leaders and lecturers are known sceptics; while in their own free workshop and public house conversations and discussions unbelief as to the truth and divinity of Christianity is plainly expressed. I may here add the testimony of a working man of unusual intelligence, and having the most favourable opportunities of forming a correct opinion. Speaking of some extensive works where thousands of hands are employed, he assured me that ninety out of every hundred contemptuously rejected some at least of the teachings of orthodox religion.

Facts, too, suggest that we should inquire somewhat concerning the attitude of our more highly educated trading and mercantile classes, and also of our professional men. To what extent are they earnestly and intelligently on the side of revealed religion? It is more difficult to ascertain their real views than those of the class previously referred to. In many instances they are more modest, reserved, and cautious in the expression of their opinions on religious subjects. But, so far as we can judge, is there reason to believe that anything like the majority of them possess a knowledge of the evidences of Christianity, or have any strong and settled convictions as to its truth? Many of them, it is true, attend some place of worship, contribute to religious purposes, and frequently defend and uphold religion as serving some useful moral and social ends. These things, however, cannot be accepted as proof of their intelligent and genuine faith in the Divine origin and doctrines of orthodox Christianity, nor even of their belief in any religion at all. In cases not a few scepticism is known to be the

* The first of Mr. Dunn's letters appears in the present number, and we earnestly call special attention to the whole series. They will be found replete with the mellow wisdom of sanctified experience.—W. M.

Digitized by Google

creed of clerks, tradesmen, and merchants, whose range of reading is somewhat wider than that of others; while many of our lawyers, doctors, and other professional men are regarded by those who know them best as "freethinkers."

What is, perhaps, a much more serious aspect of this subject, is to be found in the wide existence of what I understand Dr. Ellicott to mean by "suspended belief;" and which may be described as *unsettlement* in the minds of those who have believed—and who continue to believe—but whose faith is shaken by facts and reasonings of which they had previously been ignorant, and whose quiet assurance is sorely disturbed by restless under currents of doubt. A painful feeling of uncertainty results; in some cases it has reference to particular doctrines or aspects of revealed religion, in others to its truth altogether. This state of mind is to be found among persons of all classes and churches: men and women of pure life, of sincere heart and of reverent spirit; anxious to know the truth and mourning over their doubts and difficulties. It is not confined to the laity; the clergy and ministers of all sections of the Christian Church could doubtless supply some—perhaps many—illustrations in their own ranks. Facts warrant the assertion that there are instances where the dogmatic tone of public ministrations is the very opposite of the doubt and questioning of the secret heart. The creed of the pulpit sometimes continues in its orthodox intactness, notwithstanding disturbing and destroying hands have been laid upon the creed of the study. It is difficult to imagine a more painful, or more morally damaging position, than that in which a calm aspect of full persuasion is employed to cover the unrest of a perplexed mind. Even in publicly reading portions of Scripture which the reader does not, and cannot, accept in the commonly received sense,—but which he dares not otherwise expound, the moral nature must suffer some injury. Yet there are proofs that this is the position, and that this is the experience, of some at least, and we think of many, of our spiritual guides.

There are minds in which occasional and partial unsettlement may not only be comparatively harmless, but even answer some useful ends. The late Dr. Stowell once playfully remarked, that he liked to have a little heresy working in his mind as it kept him alert for the truth. But in the unsettlement described, existing under the conditions indicated, there is always danger of unfavourable results. Such doubt and perplexity may lead to confirmed scepticism or hopeless indifference. Its existence and prevalence may, therefore, be viewed with as much concern as that of avowed infidelity.*

* I avail myself of the opportunity afforded in revising the "proof sheets" to refer to *Letters to the Perplexed*, by the Rev. H. H. Dobney, now appearing in the *Christian World*. "No. I.—Preliminary" assumes the existence "of very serious disturbance and unsettlement in all the schools of religious thought—say churches, if you will;" and is written in a spirit of tender yet manly sympathy with honestly perplexed minds.—J.S.

Digitized by Google

In addition to what has been said in support of Dr. Ellicott's assertions, and in justification of his fears, attention might be directed to the periodical press. Perhaps no class of men more quickly and accurately catch the spirit of the time and more faithfully reflect prevailing opinions and sentiments than the newspaper and popular magazine writers. What, then, it may be asked, is their bearing towards Christianity? Are not religious subjects discussed with unusual freedom of thought and expression? Are not the facts of science in their supposed antagonism to revelation boldly enunciated? Are not weak points in the evidences of Christianity more or less plainly pointed out? and are not some of the dogmas which are imagined to form a portion of the Bible's teaching freely criticised and condemned? Even in professedly religious periodicals there is often found something of an apologetic tone: many old opinions, whether true or false we do not now inquire, are strangely modified or altogether set aside; while admissions are made and principles are adopted, which afford proof that great changes of thought and feeling are taking place; and that too in the direction of unbelief, if not of revealed religion altogether, yet of Christianity as it is commonly understood and taught.

In these things, as well as in many others, do we not see enough to justify the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol in the selection of "Modern Unbelief" as the subject of his charge, and in the earnest spirit in which he has treated it?

The *Causes of Modern Unbelief* may form the subject of a future paper. *J. S.

THE GREAT WITNESS.

"Christ Jesus before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession."
1 TIM. vi. 13.

THE Man of Sorrows stood,
The darkest hour of time,
Serenely calm at Pilate's bar,
Deponing truth sublime.

Strong Rome had crushed the world
Beneath its iron hand,
Which nations felt their warlike skill
Unable to withstand.

But now another King,
Stronger than Cæsar far,
Clad in the panoply of love,
For God and man makes war.

He wears no purple robe,
No soldiers wait his nod,
Yet is he of most royal birth,
The holy Son of God.

Digitized by Google

Born to redeem mankind,
And after that to wield
The sceptre of omnipotence,
Eternal truth his shield!

We thank thee, glorious Lord,
Thou faithful One from heaven,
That to the world, through Pilate's Court,
Such witness thou hast given!

O help us, true to thee,
Servants and friends of thine,
To testify by lip and life,
That thou art King divine!

THE KINGDOM OF THE SON OF MAN.

"I SAW in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. . . . The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever. . . . Judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. . . . And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." (Dan. vii. 13, 14, 18, 22, 27.)

When will these "night visions" of the man "greatly beloved" —the John of the Old Testament—become realised facts in the light of day, to the joy of suffering humanity and the deliverance of a groaning creation? The nations are in a terrible state of confusion, not indeed for the first or the hundredth time; for the war fever is an old epidemic which has brought millions of men to a violent death; but the present "distress of nations with perplexity" seems to us an index finger pointing to the end of the long reign of terror, and the beginning of a new system of government in our distracted world. Brute force, aided by wonderful mechanical art, seems to have reached its limit in the science of destruction. What we in our vain-glorious boasting call "civilisation"—a word which one should utter with a consciousness of grim irony—has invented weapons of wholesale slaughter compared with which those of the nations of antiquity, that we call barbarous, were but

Digitized by Google

as dangerous toys. There is a jealous rivalry among the states of "Christian" Europe in the manufacture of the thunder-bolts of death. Steam-rams; floating castles; iron plated monsters of the deep; terrible torpedoes—for the invention of which the Evil One should have a patent—eighty-ton, one-hundred-ton guns (the latest suggestion is that we might manage to manufacture a two-hundred-ton messenger to convey our compliments to our friend the enemy) bear witness to the triumphs of our splendid civilisation!

But can all this incredible mockery of Christian principle by "Christian" nations last *much longer?* Of course we know that the subjugation of the world to Christ by the message of *grace* is one of those things that we have no authority to expect, notwithstanding the assurance of ten thousand pulpits that the gospel will, by and by, convert the race. But though a church co-extensive with humanity is not in the revealed purpose of God, an election out of the world being the declared arrangement for the present dispensation, yet we have a right to ask nations *professing* the Christian faith why it is that the Christian principle of peace has not long ago become an international policy ratified by the sovereign powers, and pronounced for ever inviolable? The idea of such a league among the states of Christendom does not strike the mind as impossible. Why should it? Would not all the covenanting parties be immediately and immensely benefited by it? Millions of taxes which now press heavily on the industrial portions of nations would be removed, and millions of men, now required for standing armies, would be liberated to develope the material resources of the world, whilst the evil passions engendered by war, and the enormous suffering entailed by it on forlorn widows and helpless orphans would come to an end. Every nation *knows* that the horrors of war are literally unspeakable. An "appeal to arms" is simply brute force measuring itself with brute force. Victor and vanquished alike suffer, although in different ways. It is in the nature of things that they should; for the unwritten law of eternal right,—the foundation of all the written codes of morality—will have its way, will demand its penalty. No man sins with inpunity, whether the sin be against himself, his fellow, or his God. Swiftly or slowly, the penalty is sure to descend upon the sinner. He has sinned, and the fact must be brought home to him. So with nations. They have suffered, and will suffer so long as they try to excel each other in the science of destruction, so long as material force is a greater factor in foreign policy than human brotherhood, and so long as naval and military estimates are the largest item in annual budgets.

It will be necessary for God's anointed King, when he comes to his throne, to break the heathen and their infatuated kings with a rod of iron, and to dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel; for he will find the world in arms against him, fiercely determined that they will not have this man to reign over them. But there will

Digitized by Google

be this essential difference between the assertion of authority by the Son of Man and that of the kings of the earth, that his severity will have the swiftness of mercy, that he may destroy the world's destroyers, and introduce the blessed reign of prosperity and peace. "The kings of the earth" have turned many beautiful and fruitful portions of the world into miserable deserts. Their practice is to make a solitude and call it peace. His genial government, after he has, by a short work of retributive justice, swept his foes to destruction, will present to the eyes of all spectators the vision of the Hebrew seer in realised fact:—

The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad,
The desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose;
It shall blossom abundantly and rejoice
Even with joy and singing.
The glory of Lebanon shall be given to it,
The beauty of Carmel and Sharon.
They shall see the glory of the Lord,
The majesty of our God.
Strengthen ye the weak hands,
And confirm the feeble knees.
Say to them that are of a fearful heart,
Be strong, fear not,
Behold your God will come with vengeance,
Even God with a recompense—he will come and save you.
Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened,
And the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.
Then shall the lame man leap as a hart,
And the tongue of the dumb shall sing.
For in the wilderness shall waters break out,
And streams in the desert.
And the parched ground shall become a pool,
And the thirsty land springs of water.
In the habitation of dragons where each lay,
Shall be grass with reeds and rushes.
And an highway shall be there, and a way,
And it shall be called the way of holiness.
The unclean shall not pass over it,
For he himself shall be with them.
The wayfaring men though fools shall not err therein.
No lion shall be there,
Nor ravenous beast shall go up thereon.
It shall not be found there,
But the redeemed shall walk there.
And the ransomed of the Lord shall return
And come to Zion with songs,
And everlasting joy upon their heads.
They shall obtain joy and gladness.
And sorrow and sighing shall flee away.—(Isaiah xxxv.)

This and many similar oracles of men who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, are bright lights from heaven over the darkness of the world, not only revealing that darkness to our moral apprehension as something to excite our abhorrence and to create the desire for a better state of things, but also as the assur-

Digitized by Google

ance of God that a better state of things has been determined upon by him, and will actually take place at the pre-ordained time. The woes of humanity under the tyranny of most of its rulers, and the incompetence of others, should have taught it long ago to look for a time when divine righteousness shall assume the government of the world. The intolerable iniquities, crimes, murders, and abominations (which civilised speech dare not utter) which have been committed in the name of justice should have convinced all thoughtful men that if there be a righteous and omnipotent God, cognisant—as he must be—of what is going on in his world, he must appear *some day* to vindicate the right and destroy the oppressors of mankind.

The application of these remarks to nations that have not heard that it *is* the Creator's purpose to bring to nought "the rulers of this world" (1Cor. ii. 6) is not of course intended. They groaned, wished, wondered; their sufferings caused them to yearn for deliverance; but whether such deliverance should ever come they had no information. They knew not that it would come in the time appointed of the Father, by the great Anointed of the Father, the Lover of man, the Son of Man, the Son of God.

But when we turn to Christian nations the whole case is altered from every point of view. These know, or should know—and it is upon this "should" that the weight of responsibility rests—that "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts xvii. 31.) But instead of listening to the divine voice so often uttered, the divine purpose so clearly revealed in both Testaments, from generation to generation, respecting the glorious King to whom God has committed the government of this great world, they put it aside as a mystical thing too intangible in its meaning to be understood by men of the world—these men of the world having resolved in the secret of their hearts that if they cannot kill the heir a second time they will do their utmost to keep him out of his inheritance. Imagine a debate in any parliament, or house of representatives in Christendom, in which some member should allude to the coming of the Son of Man as the divine solution of all legislative difficulties. How would the allusion be received? For the first instant with profound amazement, as if a bombshell had burst in the hall, and then with contemptuous laughter at the fanaticism that had introduced a sentiment so utterly absurd! And in what light would the unhappy member be received by his fellow legislators ever after? As a monomaniac qualified for a meeting of religious enthusiasts, and, therefore, utterly disqualified for a seat among intelligent statesmen! Let us indulge our fancy a moment more and look at our foolish friend at the next general or local election. How have the "Christian" electors of his borough rewarded him for his noble testimony to one

Digitized by Google

of the clearest truths in the Book which they all profess to take as the guide of life? By rejecting him, of course!

No. Instead of the kings of the earth recognising the indubitable *fact* that they are only provisional rulers, until he come whose right it is to exercise universal authority, the idea of his return to his inheritance, if by chance it ever comes before them, is forthwith banished as unworthy of a serious thought. Instead of gracefully bowing to the inevitable,—"Kiss the Son,"—schemes for personal aggrandizement and the perpetuation of their dynasties prove that in their hearts they think that their power shall continue for ever. Meanwhile, the nations have no light from parliaments or press on the solemn fact that every thing is in transition. The people, like so many children, are set to play with toys labelled respectively, Tory, Whig, Radical, Republican, Democrat; and of course the well-being of a nation, in which this political game of chance is played, not to say the destiny of the world itself, is represented as dependent on the issue of the game.

"Babel?" Yes, undoubtedly. The division of tongues is not to be questioned. There can be no unbelievers in relation to this matter. We want to get us a name of governmental glory in the world. Our towering pride shall reach above the clouds. And so he whose rule we like not has confounded our language. We do not understand each other, *simply because we will not understand our God*. There is the fact, and there is the explanation!

But surely, if we turn to "the Church," the recognised "witness" and public advocate of divine truth, we shall find that there is no uncertain sound in her words respecting the coming and the Kingdom of the Son of Man. Alas! this, our last refuge, completely fails us. "Babel" is here too. With pious speech and great show of humility the church also wanted to build a tower and get to herself everlasting renown. In her most powerful secular development, her Latin branch, this is so clear that the reader of Ecclesiastical history needs only the hint to find the facts for himself. She would conquer the world, and bring all nations to Christ, that, is, to herself, for Christ was not to come back, having delegated all power to his vicar, the chief bishop of this holy church! The same kind of pompous talk indicating ignorance, or forgetfulness, of the clearly declared design of God—and either is reprehensible—is heard from Protestant churches. The names here that indicate division, are not the same, verbally, as are found in the political gymnasium, but essentially they are the same—that is to say, "Babel." For ecclesiastical confusion, however you may shield it by words that have acquired a conventional sanctity, is really no better—perhaps a shade worse!—than the architectural confusion in which our typical Babel had its rise. If belief in the coming of the Lord at any time, as a determined *fact* in the divine purpose, and as the ONLY remedy for the necessities of men, were common to all the divisions and sub-divisions of the nominal

Digitized by Google

church, one could look upon her many names as a minor evil, as, in fact, a very unimportant thing; but instead of this, the second advent—*in its Biblical meaning*—is generally ignored, and the question among the sects, both within and without the body called the Church of England, is, "which of them should be accounted the greatest." We cannot but see that this eccelesiastical pride goes before a fall.

Rival statistics af numbers and wealth are extremely suspicious things in connection with men whose real business in the world is to bear witness to Christ. Each seems to say, "See what *I* do;"—an egotism which, in spite of genuine brotherly kindness—hold! *because* of geniune brotherly kindness—forces us to think of the letter to the Laodiceans. It is needless to quote it, but those who wish to see what the Spirit says about the *last* phase of ecclesiasticism will do well to make it a study. Our modern churches do not *wish* the Lord's return. They are very comfortable as they are! Wealth and luxury, together with the modern fashion of "spiritualising" truth, have blinded the witnesses, and any prophet of the wilderness who boldly says that their testimony is worthless is a heretic and a troubler of Israel, to whom respectable Christians will, of course, pay no attention. Well! Be it so. The Kingdom of the Son of Man is coming, notwithstanding. Every day brings it nearer, and every day brings intelligence from every part of the world, civilised and savage, which proves that the world can have no permanent peace until it becomes the Kingdom of the Son of Man, the Prince of Peace. ED.

THOUGHTS ON CHRISTIAN WORK AND OUR CHRISTIAN CONDITION.

IN THREE LETTERS.

LETTER I.—*Christian Work and Christian Character.*

EVERY Christian will, I doubt not, agree with me in expressing thankfulness to God that, during the last half century, a great impulse has been given to almost every movement that has been set on foot for the promotion of the spiritual interests of the community. CHRISTIAN WORK has, during that time, been in a thousand forms undertaken and carried on with energy by multitudes, especially of the young, who, in past days, were altogether unaccustomed to labours of this discription. For such a change it well becomes us to give thanks.

But while doing so we are bound, I think, with no less earnestness, to ponder our ways; to weigh carefully what has been accom-

Digitized by Google

plished; to avoid self-complacency regarding it: and to ascertain, if possible, the exact value of our labours.

On this last point we are always in danger of self-deception, since we are naturally prone to look too exclusively at that which is within our own experience; to omit noticing results on a larger scale; and, from a well-meant but ill-judged fear of consequences, to avoid contemplating anything which, we imagine might, if realised in its true proportions, tend to dishearten.

My own mind, perhaps, being peculiarly constituted, and my field of observation having been unusually extensive, I have been led into a series of reflections on this subject, the substance of which I am desirous of submitting to others, in order that their precise value may be estimated by men who are wiser than myself.

Three things in particular have arrested my attention. The *first* is, the sad fact that while the existing generation of working men in England have, for the most part, been brought up in Sunday schools, and therefore been accustomed both to read their Bibles, and to attend public worship, these very persons, looking at them as a whole—for many happy exceptions are doubtless to be met with—having arrived at manhood, are commonly found to neglect religion altogether; to express something like hatred of Christian ministers; to laugh at tract distributors; and to tolerate, rather than to welcome, the visits of Christian persons to their families. This is, I say, very sad, but it is a true picture of a class once rejoiced in as Sunday-school *scholars*. I think this a loud call for serious thought.

The *second* fact on which I have meditated is, that so many—I dare not attempt to estimate numbers—of those who have been in their day Sunday-school *teachers* are now avowed sceptics. I am not sure that ministers of religion are aware of the extent to which unbelief has spread, and is spreading among this class of persons; for those of whom I speak, chiefly belonging to the middle classes of society, habitually avoid giving utterance to objectionable views before those whom they respect; are accustomed to attend churches or chapels with their families, and not unfrequently share in the communion of the Lord's Supper. They are also very often remarkable for their amiability, and they cultivate a religious tone in their conversation, which, being the result of early influences, is natural to them and by no means indicates hypocrisy. But it hides *much*.

The *third* point I have been led to notice is, that in the opinion of unbelievers, popular Evangelical teaching, judging from its fruits, does not appear to have produced a *Christ-like* character in persons who have adhered to these views through a somewhat lengthened life.

I am anxious not to misrepresent what is said on this matter. Unbelievers do not, when they speak of the absence of a Christ-like character in Evangelical professors, refer to anything that comes

Digitized by Google

within the scope of ordinary Christianised morality. Such persons, they would doubtless admit, are, as a rule, somewhat above others in their general conduct—in all that society demands as evidence of religious character. They are ready to allow that Christians are commonly moved, both in speech and action, by higher and more spiritual considerations than those which act on the mass of mankind. But, in spite of all this, they will not allow that in any sense they shine as "lights in the world;" and such, they are persuaded, is the view commonly taken by candid and truthful observers.

This judgment—however painful it may be to say so—is not altogether without foundation. As in every age and in all countries a *conventional* standard of right and wrong prevails, according to which alone men are judged by their fellows, it is not *usually* deemed fair to expect from men anything more than conformity to this Christianised public opinion. If a religious man—say in his dealings—obviously falls *below* that standard, which he often does, either in consequence of defective commercial training, or, from foolishly despising the lower motives which govern secular men, and, perhaps it may be added, from imagining that his devout habits, and more or less correct beliefs, will preserve him from dangers to which others are exposed, he is too often credited with hypocrisy, while religion itself is frequently held up to contempt as a powerless profession, when tested by the daily transactions of life.

The sinner, conscious that great injustice is done to him when he is in this fashion ranked with hypocrites, too often falls back upon his religious integrity as if that should condone his fault, and instead of perceiving the particular moral defects that deform his character, and have undermined his position, dwells on his good intentions, and on the wrongs done to him by the world.

The Christian body with which he has been connected, injured and irritated by the reproach he has brought upon them, may eject him from their fellowship, and wonder at men's misjudgment of piety, but they commonly shrink from investigating the true causes of their brother's failure, and refuse altogether to admit the possibility of defect in the moral and spiritual education they are engaged in imparting. The result is a wide-spread opinion—in many, however, nothing better than a shallow prejudice—that popular Evangelical teaching does not produce a *Christ*-like character. But this is not the ground the more serious sceptics take.

The *distinguishing characteristics* of the Christian faith—the peculiar features of our Lord's teaching and that of his Apostles, say our critics—and truly—are not to be found in the importance attached by him to commercial integrity, to faithfulness in domestic obligations, to truthfulness, or even to benevolence, deeply important as such virtues are; for, some of them at least have been nobly illustrated by Pagans, Mohammedans, and by Atheists. All secular virtue, many of them admit, even in its widest and most

Digitized by Google

comprehensive relations may be embraced by Christianity, but does not therefore constitute it.

This witness is true; but we may go much further and say, that nothing which the world in general is prepared to welcome and to honour is a *characteristic* of Christ's message to mankind. Neither the recognition of a Divine Being and a future life; desire of reward or dread of punishment in a world which is to come; the acceptance of a doctrine of atoning sacrifice, or of any theological scheme, however good or true, when taken singly or combined, make men Christians. For all these things, held too in connection with much that is beautiful and blameless in practical life, frequently distinguish persons who—whatever may be their standing before God, or whatever their destiny beyond the grave—are not in Christ's sense, bearers of his cross. They may be attached followers of ecclesiastical bodies, zealous defenders of creeds, or active agents in the accomplishment of much good in the world, but they are not necessarily disciples of the Redeemer.

The first great question, then, we have to consider, is this,—What *are* the distinguishing characteristics of Christianity? Unless we are agreed upon these it is vain to endeavour to ascertain whether or no we are exemplifying them. Holy Scripture, regarded as giving us in substance the true words of Christ and his apostles, and a true picture of their lives, can alone furnish us with material for forming a correct judgment.

Now the first feature that strikes one as every way peculiar to Christianity is the *absolute disinterestedness* it enforces and illustrates. I am not, of course, referring to that kind of disinterestedness—beautiful as it may be—which is sometimes manifested in great acts of self-sacrifice. For these have, at the call of patriotism, or some other exciting motive, been exhibited by Pagans: but of that pervading regard for the welfare of others, and that entire freedom from selfish aims and ends in daily and ordinary life, which was unknown to the world before the advent of Christ, and which is too often practically unknown to multitudes who regard themselves as his disciples.

The maxim on which—whether avowed or not—men *act* has been thus expressed, "Every one for himself, and God for us all." The Divine doctrine is,—Every one for his neighbour, and God will take care of the unselfish one,—a doctrine which the man of the world practically laughs to scorn. Christians, while they honour the injunction of the Lord, almost invariably decline to realise either its length or breadth. They say in their hearts, "Every one admits that in a world like this it is simply impossible to be disinterested, or literally to love one's neighbour *as oneself*, therefore the spirit and not the letter of the commandment is alone binding. It is only indeed by each one looking after his own interest that the interests of all can possibly be attended to. Whatever Paul may have written about no man "seeking his own," but every man

Digitized by Google

"another's wealth" or well-being, it is impossible that he can intend to teach anything contrary to the great principle that a man's *first* duty is to look after his own affairs; then to attend to those of his family; and, after these have been regarded, to be mindful of the welfare of others.

So we reason. Are we right or wrong in our conclusions? And to what extent?

A second peculiarity in *specifically Christian* doctrine is, the *discouragement* it throws on the desire, which is so natural to man, of becoming influential by the accumulation of wealth. The love of *getting* is, by Christ, classed with the love of *keeping*. Both are considered vices.

I do not say that the Bible teaches that accumulation is in itself wrong. On the contrary, it commends the prudence and economy which are inseparable therefrom. By implication it bids a man "lay up" for his children, and by various exhortations to those who are rich, it recognises the widest differences in the extent of men's possessions. But it always speaks of wealth as *undesirable*, as involving many dangers, and therefore as a thing to be avoided rather than to be sought by the Christian. Such texts as "Labour not to be rich," "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," "Sell that ye have and give alms," "The deceitfulness of riches choke the word," "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God," and such like, can scarcely admit of any other interpretation.

Modern piety, however, disclaims this doctrine. *Its* exhortation is, "Get money to any extent that may be consistent with integrity, and use it aright. God has devolved upon his church the conversion of the world, a work that can only be carried on in proportion as silver and gold are dedicated to his cause, *therefore* acquire largely, if possible, and give liberally."

Christ and his Church certainly here seem to be disagreed.

The same may be said of *Earthly Distinctions*. The spirit of New Testament teaching clearly seems to be, "Seek them not." If in the providence of God they come to you, in the form of office or otherwise, and bring with them, power, influence, or honour, receive them as *trusts*, to be used, under a high sense of responsibility, for the good of men and for the glory of God! But they are by no means to be sought. If their attainment involves strife and self-assertion they are to be avoided, for the Christian must neither strive nor assert his merits. They may be accepted, but only in the way of duty.

Modern views of Christian obligation do not seem to embrace this view of things. The disciples of Christ are now taught that power and honour are lawful objects of their ambition; that they may be struggled for with the greatest intensity, if by that means they can be secured; that all power and all influence, whether

Digitized by Google

arising from wealth or office, may be used for Divine ends, and *ought to be desired*, since thereby the advancement of Christ's kingdom may be promoted.

Again, therefore, it seems that Christ and his Church are, to some extent, disagreed.

The third peculiarity that may be noticed is, the enforcement of Christian charity, embracing, as it does, candour in judging others, and an unwillingness to think evil of any one; a state of mind unknown to the world before Christ came, and one still supposed by many to be somewhat inconsistent with zeal for truth. Mourn over the fact as we may, it can scarcely be denied that, in all ages, earnestness, especially in religious matters, has been generally associated with more or less of intolerance. It is so still. As a consequence *indifference* in relation to truth is justified by multitudes who, by our contentiousness of spirit and uncharitableness, have been led to imagine that want of candour, and practical unkindness towards those who are supposed to be in error, necessarily follows deep convictions, especially when accompanied by strong desires to impress these convictions on others.

The motto, "First pure, then peaceable," like many other perverted Scriptures, is emblazoned on banners raised in the cause of Christ, and love is lost in defence of views which, whether right or wrong, have no value in the sight of the Lord when separated from that Divine attribute. We do not indeed now so mistake the extent of our responsibility as to justify persecution in furtherance of what we regard as true religion, but it may well be questioned whether this improvement is not rather the result of enlarged views of civil liberty than a better understanding of our Christian obligations.

On this point of charity we have undoubtedly still much to learn, and the lesson is one which can only be learnt when we come to perceive that the widest differences of opinion *as to what is revealed* may not only be consistent with godliness, but that these differences are actually unavoidable; that they, or rather the circumstances that produce them, are foreordained by God in order to promote thereby humility, candour, and love towards those who oppose themselves; *foreordained*, because the necessary consequence of our individuality before God; foreordained, because arising out of the Divinely ordered character and structure of Holy Scripture; foreordained, because the attainment of truth was never intended to be the peculiar privilege of the intellectual, the learned, the favoured by position or circumstances, but a common boon to mankind; *limited*, without doubt to many *in extent*, but attainable by each individual according to his needs, and in proportion to his spiritual endowments,—to his thirst for Divine knowledge, his meekness and lowliness of spirit, and his love to God and man.

Digitized by Google

Hence the guilt of unkind and uncandid judgments. Hence the folly of imagining that truths, essential to ourselves, are equally essential *to all;* that intellectual divergences necessarily arise from moral defects, although they frequently do so; that uniformity in belief can alone produce oneness of character; that error, even on the most vital points, *in itself* justifies our alienation from the man who is ensnared by it; or that obedience to the apostolic command, "Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," implies, or authorises anything beyond loving earnestness in argument, and a holy example in our conduct.

We may gather wisdom, I think, on this subject from our Lord's judgments on the Pharisees of old. These men were not, as we have been led to suppose, simply a body of self-righteous and insincere professors. They were ardent zealots for what they thought to be truth. As they had no private ends to serve, they thought, I doubt not, that they were moved by love of souls alone. Their grand and fatal error was zeal without love. They compassed sea and land to make a proselyte, because they thought this to be their first duty, and the highest proof they could give of their sincerity. But they were destitute of charity towards those who differed from them, and they were, *therefore*, rightly denounced as hypocrites by one who knew what was in them. For to call men to God, who is essentially love, without manifesting the possession of that grace of the Spirit, is surely at best a species of hyprocrisy. It was because they were destitute of this charity that, like Saul of Tarsus, they persecuted, and imagined that, in the indulgence of an intolerant spirit, they were serving God acceptably.

Pharisaism in Judea probably exhibited what some forms of religious life now do in England—the *running to seed* of what was once healthy and beautiful. Experience teaches us how often "The real virtues of one age become the spurious ones of the next. When, in the progress of the human race, any new ground is gained, whether in truth or morals, the original gainers of that ground are minds which were penetrated by true conceptions, and by an inward, sacred light. But it is totally different when the new ground being once made, a succeeding generation has to use it. The use of it then is no guarantee of moral rank. And yet every particular age is apt to suppose that its own virtues are of such peculiar excellence that they cannot but guarantee the motive. So the Jew argued in the case of his favourite the Pharisee. How could there be anything amiss when there was so much zeal?"*

And so any one might say of the virtues of an advanced age like ours. Yet we too may compass sea and land in order to bring

* Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, by Dr. J. B. Mozley, Regius Professor of Divinity.

Digitized by Google

men to God, while wanting in that love which alone qualifies for the kingdom. This is almost sure to be the case when heat is separated from light, when zeal supplants charity, or when, as the consequence thereof, our righteousness falls below the Divine standard, and we justify our declension, as the Pharisees did, by diluting the law of God, till we make it of little practical avail.

* Henry Dunn.

EVANGELISATION IN HADES.*

THESE books are written from widely different points of view. Mr. Paul's work, which we will designate No. 1, for facility of reference, regards Hades, or the intermediate state of man from death to resurrection, as a condition in which a great work of evangelisation goes on. Mr. Biddle (No. 2) considers Hades as a condition of unconscious sleep in which no change of state can possibly come. Time during it is virtually annihilated to the sleeper. The moment of death is to the sleeper, be he prepared or not for judgment, the moment of resurrection (ii. 26-28). In our brief review we will concern ourselves chiefly with the first of these works. Should our remarks ever reach Mr. Paul's eye, we beg to assure him that they are written in no unfriendly spirit, while against his whole theory we are compelled emphatically to protest.

The very title of his work, though titles of a like kind are far from uncommon, is inappropriate. He calls it an essay on the "Discipline of the Soul *beyond the Grave*." This title, if words were only taken in their obvious sense, would signify the discipline of the soul when the power of the grave was past, i.e., at resurrection. Mr. Paul, however, means it of an asserted discipline of the soul while the power of the grave remains unbroken. He does not seem to allow of any probation whatever to any one after the second coming of Christ, though in truth multitudes of those who shall be alive at that solemn time will require, and be entitled to a further probation just as much as those who died before the second advent of the Lord. We would commend it to Mr. Paul's attention whether, if he can find no room for further probation after the second advent for any of the then living, this one fact alone does not overthrow his theory that a further probation beyond that they received in this life is extended to all who died before. Surely the latter are not selected for special favour.

---

* I. Son, Remember: an Essay on the Discipline of the Soul beyond the Grave. By the Rev. John Paul, B.A., Rector of St. Albans, Worcester. London, 1875.—II. The Spirit Controversy. By Daniel Biddle. Williams and Norgate.

Digitized by Google

The destruction and punishment of the wicked we are glad to find Mr. Paul puts off to the "end of this world," i.e., to the close of this age or dispensation in which we now live (i. v. 88). The idea that the righteous inherit the kingdom prepared for them, or that the reprobate are consigned to their everlasting punishment, on death, is very properly rejected by Mr. Paul as an unscriptural error. There is really for both, according to him, an intermediate state. It is on its nature that he differs wholly from us, and, as we maintain, from Scripture too.

With his just and scriptural view that the peculiar punishment of the reprobate does not commence until after their resurrection and the judgment day, Mr. Paul finds it very difficult to account "how the opinion, that man's eternal destiny is fixed at the moment of the death of his body, at first obtained." (iv.) To us, with our views, this does not appear at all strange or hard to be accounted for. We will presently say why. Meanwhile, we will tell our readers why it appears so strange to Mr. Paul.

He is one of that very numerous body of Platonic Christians *which does not believe that any man dies!* Mr. Paul knows the true and proper meaning of death, for he allows that the body of man dies. Death is with him the loss of vital existence or being. But then, according to him, the body which dies is not the true man at all. The soul is the ego, the person, the entity, the true man we call ourselves, and this soul does not die in the intermediate state at all. (3, 22, 99, 33.) The notion that any man really dies is utterly rejected by Mr. Paul. Thus, whereas the Bible from Genesis to Revelation abounds in assertion that it is appointed unto all to die, and that all really do die, Mr. Paul, with the great school of Platonic Christians, insists that no man ever dies, that there is no such thing as death for man. Birds, beasts, and fishes, all of them die; but man is an immortal, and does not die at all. Graveyards, with him, are full of the old clothes which men once wore, or of the old houses in which men once dwelt or lodged, but they have no dead men in them at all. A favourite definition of the body with Mr. Paul is, that it is man's "*lodging house.*" (29.)

With his idea that men are alive when Scripture says that they are dead, Mr. Paul finds it difficult to account for the origin of the common Christian opinion that man's destiny is fixed at the hour of dissolution. He speaks here of the destiny of the wicked, i.e., of those who have not truly turned to God during their earthly life. "Here," he says, "are myriads upon myriads living in what is only an altered condition of existence in the Hades state, who are not in it handed over to eternal punishment,—what is to be done with them?—how do they, and how have they been spending a period which with many of them has already lasted for at least six thousand years?" At an utter loss how otherwise to account for their use of this long period, or for God's giving it to them,

Digitized by Google

straightway rises up to his sanguine mind the cheerful view that Hades affords to the wicked a second probation; that in it redeeming agencies are set to work, and the Divine Spirit operates upon souls which in the earthly life, for one reason or other, had not been saved. Undisciplined souls are brought under discipline in Hades. If he cannot, with Origen, save all of them, he will at least save some.

We confess we do not wonder that Mr. Paul, with his ideas of that condition so improperly called death, should entertain this notion; and then, in his earnest and interesting volume, should attempt to justify and support it by the power of reasoning, and by a few texts of Scripture. It seems so strange that myriads should be doing nothing in that Hades state where they have lived so long, that we are not surprised that benevolent minds should engage them in something which would, or, at least, might and ought to be of service to them. So, Mr. Paul speaking ably for such, puts forward his "second chance" for all the departed. The Hades, which is painted so gloomily in the Bible, becomes a great missionary field, where good agencies operate with more or less of power, according to the charity or the imagination of the various painters of the Platonic school. Some suppose that a great many are saved in Hades; some, that the greater number are rescued; some, that all but a few absolutely incurable characters are plucked from the burning; some, not a few, that none remain unsaved. Mr. Paul apparently does not see his way to *universal* restoration.

Shall we tell him why we dismiss his scheme and all kindred schemes as untrue? We do not base our rejection upon the words of a parable which, when interpreted apart from other and plainer scriptures, Mr. Paul most justly calls "the very frailest of supports." Upon the uniform testimony of Scripture we rest our assertion that the evangelisation of a single soul while the power of the grave remains unbroken is a simple impossibility, because during that whole period Scripture tells us that *the departed are dead*, can therefore know nothing, hear nothing, do nothing; cannot be affected in any way at all, be it for good or evil.

Here are a few texts of scripture; they could be multiplied a hundredfold. "Dust *thou* art, and unto dust *thou* shalt return:" "The dead know not anything:" "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither *thou goest*:" "the night cometh, when no man can work." (Gen. iii. 19; Eccl. ix. 5-10; John ix. 4.)

How, we ask, is Mr. Paul or any one to say of these and hundreds of similar texts that they are true of the body, i.e., of man's worn-out dress or abandoned lodging house, but that they are not true of the real man himself? Is this honest treatment of Scripture? Is it not rather a contemptuous rejection of its teaching? The Bible says that the entity, the person, the

Digitized by Google

man, is dust, and turns to dust, and in this whole condition knows nothing and does nothing. Mr. Paul and his whole school assert that the entity, the person, the true man we call ourselves, is not dust, never turns to dust, can during the whole continuance of dissolution know and work!

For what purpose does Scripture put forward perpetually such texts as the above? Surely in most solemn warning! But, as surely, Mr. Paul's treatment of them makes them one and all a mere brutum fulmen—thunder without its bolt. Mr. Paul would say: True, your body will know nothing in dissolution, but *you* will know more than ever: true, there is no wisdom nor device in the grave, but *you* will not go to the grave at all: true, your body cannot then work, but *you* may work, yea work the noblest and greatest work that men can do with God's help!

Whatever Mr. Paul may say of such explanation of Scripture, we call it shameful treatment of the word of God. But why should we find fault with this individual writer, or with that? Mr. Paul is but one of a multitude who repeat the same, led on by the tenet that when the Bible says man dies, man does not die, and that the Bible says what is untrue. Primates, and moderators, and elders, and churches, all follow Plato instead of God.

We have taken up so much of the space allotted to us in the pages of the RAINBOW with Mr. Paul's work, that we have but a few words to say of Mr. Biddle's.

One point is so well put by him, that we would transfer its expression to our pages. It is a point of great importance as explanatory of the three or four passages in the New Testament which seem to teach that during the Hades state man is alive. It shows us how death is to the departed immediately consecutive with resurrection and its attendant scenes, because time is to the sleeper virtually annihilated.

Speaking of the dead in Christ, he says: "There is no weary watching of the melancholy scenes of earth, no anxious yearning over the loved ones left behind, but virtually a resurrection *instantly* to joys unspeakable. For though he may lie dead for many a long year, yet has he no sense whatever of the passage of time all that while, being utterly unconscious." And in another place he says: "On the resurrection-morn we shall wake out of a sleep, perhaps of millions of years, without having been conscious of the flight of a single hour. The only register of time we shall then have will declare our resurrection to have been *immediate*. The knowledge that time has intervened will come *afterwards*, as we gather from one and another the history of events subsequent to our death." (ii. 26–28.)

With the one observation that we do not think the day of resurrection to be so distant from us as Mr. Biddle supposes possible, we commend his view of Hades to Mr. Paul, as far more rational and far more scriptural than he has put forward in his "Son, Remember."

HENRY CONSTABLE.

Digitized by Google

NO ADVANCE!

WHILE there are branches of knowledge, as Lord Macaulay reminds us, with respect to which the law of the human mind is progress, there is one standing out conspicuously among the rest, of which no one can predicate any further advance. This is the science which we are in the habit of terming theology or divinity, the study of religion both natural and revealed. In mathematics and the inductive sciences, when once a proposition has been demonstrated it is never afterwards contested; while the sequential unfolding of every day's search furnishes new tests and carries theory nearer and nearer to perfection. Even in the more debatable provinces of civil law, government, and police, improvements have from time to time been effected, commanding not only local and temporary assent, but the general approval of mankind. The theological problem, on the other hand, is fated never to advance; nay, we are continually assured that it is to be relegated as swiftly as possible to the domain of the unknown and unknowable. And the reason is supposed to lie upon the surface. It is contended that the original materials, furnished at the outset and never supplemented by addenda, having proved insufficient to secure unity of design or adherence in structure, all hope of rearing a temple of concord must be abandoned in despair, and discordance of belief must be accepted as the Divine ultimatum.

To many minds this, of course, must seem a very tragical outlook. Can nothing be conceived or exhibited in arrest of so profane a contingency? Granted, that antagonisms of belief prevail on every hand, is it still forbidden to anticipate a happy issue? Has it not always been true that discovery is preceded by scrutiny, order by chaos, and gentle peace by the angry storm? If the unchaining of the human mind brought about by the Great Reformation be still regarded as a blessing, are we to stand shivering for fear of its results? May not the proposition, for the nonce, be entertained, that wanton excesses of thought and the freest method of uttering them may after all prove the most direct pathway to final agreement? It is at least an alternative worth investigation; for, if true, it must be illustrative of the Supreme wisdom, as well as fraught with solace for mankind.

In laying down the premises therefore and clearing the ground, let us begin with the branch of the subject known as Natural Religion, and see how far we can advance in that direction,—understanding by the phrase, a religion possible to man in his natural condition, quite irrespective of revelation; and as Lord Macaulay has so well put the case, we may here advantageously follow him.

"As respects natural religion," says he, "it is not easy to see that a philosopher of the present day is more favourably situated than Thales or Simonides. He has before him just the same evidences of design in the structure of the universe which the early Greeks had. We say, just the same; for the discoveries of modern astronomers and anatomists have really added nothing to the force of that argument which a reflecting mind finds in every beast, bird, insect, fish, leaf, flower, and shell. The reasoning by which Socrates, in Xenophon's hearing, confuted the little atheist Aristodemus, is exactly the reasoning of Paley's Natural Theology. Socrates makes exactly the same use of the statues of Poly-

Digitized by Google

cletus and the pictures of Zeuxis which Paley makes of the watch. As to the other great question, the question what becomes of man after death, we do not see that a highly educated European, left to his unassisted reason, is more likely to be in the right than a Blackfoot Indian. Not a single one of the many sciences in which we surpass the Blackfoot Indian throws the smallest light on the state of the soul after the animal life is extinct. In truth, all the philosophers, ancient and modern, who have attempted, without the help of revelation, to prove the immortality of man, from Plato down to Franklin, appear to us to have failed deplorably."

"Then again, all the great enigmas which perplex the natural theologian are the same in all ages. The ingenuity of a people just emerging from barbarism is quite sufficient to propound these enigmas; but the genius of Locke or Clarke is quite unable to solve them. It is a mistake to imagine that subtle speculations touching the Divine attributes, the origin of evil, the necessity of human actions, the foundation of moral obligation, imply any high degree of intellectual culture. Such speculations on the contrary are in a peculiar manner the delight of intelligent children and of half-civilised men." . . . "The Book of Job shows that, long before letters and arts were known to Ionia, these vexing questions were debated with no common skill and eloquence under the tents of the Idumean Emirs; nor has human reason, in the course of three thousand years, discovered any satisfactory solution of the riddles which perplexed Eliphaz and Zophar. Natural Religion then is not a progressive science."—*From the Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes.*

Such being the prospects of Natural Religion, is the case at all altered when we turn to Revealed Religion? Is there any more likelihood that good and candid men will ever reach agreement either theoretically or practically in their interpretation and acceptation of a message received direct from heaven?

The subject-matter of the message itself, we admit, differs widely enough from the former, as being more discursive, historical, and elaborate (to which we would willingly add "systematic," were it not that the contention on this point is the very subject under debate). Nevertheless a similar difficulty attends its progressive development as in the case of Natural Religion, arising from the fact that nothing further has been revealed to the nineteenth century than was known in the first. It is the belief of the Protestant churches that all Divine truth regarding the ways of God to man is recorded in certain books; and as it is pretty well agreed that not the smallest addition will ever be made to those books, it would seem to follow that the Christian student of to-day has no more means at his command for compiling a harmonious system than were possessed by his predecessor, the Christian student of the early or mediæval ages. Each has held in his hand the same unchanged unchangeable Bible, and each has professed his belief that the doctrinal statements of that Bible are susceptible of no manner of disturbance from the physical, social, or economical revolutions surging around him. But then arises the grave question, Is it a fact that either the one or the other has ever succeeded in laying down the very first article in a code of indisputable *Principia*, from which it were morally impossible to revolt,—giving some fair prospect of a gradual and symmetrical superstructure

Digitized by Google

arising on its basis of eternal granite? Is it not, on the contrary, true that from the first century down to our own time the whole affair has been simply chaotic,—a field of deadly strife, and a continuous ebb and flow of the two opposing forces of silly dogma and common sense? As there are no new data from which to start afresh, we are constantly liable to the incursions of old despotisms and the revival of forgotten heresies. Neither polite learning, nor sagacity in worldly matters, nor the diffusion of what is called civilisation, furnish any guarantee against the periodical occurrence of the gravest errors on subjects relating to the invisible world. "When we reflect," to quote Macaulay once more, "that Sir Thomas More was ready to die for the doctrine of transubstantiation, we cannot but feel some doubt whether the doctrine of transubstantiation may not triumph over all opposition. More was a man of eminent talents. He had all the information on the subject that we have, or that, while the world lasts, any human being will have. The text, 'This is my body,' was in his New Testament as it is in ours. The absurdity of the literal interpretation was as great and as obvious in the sixteenth century as it is now. No progress that science has made, or will make, can add to what seems to us the overwhelming force of the argument against the 'real presence.' We are therefore unable to understand why what Sir Thomas More believed respecting transubstantiation may not be believed to the end of time by men equal in abilities and honesty to Sir Thomas More. But Sir Thomas More is one of the choice specimens of human wisdom and virtue; and the doctrine of transubstantiation is a kind of proof-charge. A faith which stands that test will stand any test."—*Ibid.*

All which means that we are to accept as a standing phenomenon and a psychological fact, that besotted superstition in connection with the Christian faith is compatible with the loftiest moral and scientific developments of which human life is susceptible. Well, if true, this is a somewhat stunning blow at the pride of human intellect. Lord Macaulay, we imagine, was under no apprehension of such a catastrophe occurring in his own case. If he thought some of his neighbours more liable to fall under its influence than himself, doubtless he could, and he would, have placed his finger on the weak point in their reasoning; but as he has abstained from any such disclosure, we must seek it where we may. One reservation indeed is made by the sagacious essayist in view of a hypothesis which may be thus stated. Should it appear that certain theological propositions are inextricably bound up with certain other propositions which relate to physics and which science shows to be untenable, then of course the theological propositions will share in the discredit. Thus, for example, the authority on which the Chinese, Mohammedan, and Hindoo divinity-systems are built, utterly stultifies and dethrones itself when it sanctions at the same time an absurd astronomical and geographical system at which every educated person learns to laugh. Nor can we shut our eyes to the value of those philological and historical tests which have been brought to bear upon the written word, principally through the industry of German students, and in our own country by the unsparing scrutiny of such men as Dr. Giles of Oxford, whose "Christian Records" his diocesan, Bishop Wilberforce, vainly sought to suppress. In these various ways undoubtedly the pro-

Digitized by Google

gress of science may indirectly serve the cause of religious truth. Whether science has, to any appreciable extent, fortified or undermined the Christian standards, is a question which will not be discussed just now. But it may with confidence be asserted that it is not from this quarter that the great hindrances to agreement have sprung. Doctrinal combats have raged and are still raging between parties who are alike indifferent to the geological difficulty, as it is called,—who, in fact, have oft-times been in full accordance with one another on all such accidental side-issues.

The general proposition then that Divinity, properly so-called, is not a progressive science is supposed to remain undisturbed. We are still shut up to the conclusion that if society be destined to advance, it will do so, not as the result of any system of Theology, but in spite of it. For the only theology of which the Christian world happens to be cognisant is a roofless ruin, a mass of incongruous and dislocated fragments, offering shelter or security to no honest wayfarer, and merely blocking up the way. It is true that here and there among the debris may be descried various gesticulators, each loudly declaring that the small heap of ruins to the summit of which he has contrived to scramble constitutes the entire temple and is the only part of the encumbered space on which the sun deigns to shine. To such indeed the chaos may for a while longer continue to furnish, as it has long furnished, a profitable market; but the on-rushing multitude are only anxious to see it all swept away.

Then what a pitiable object does systematic theology present. Is this the fulfilment of its Divine Author's intentions? Has it no more vitality than enables it to encumber the march of other forces? And is it merely permitted, like the hoary pillars of Stonehenge, to stand as a memento of obsolete witchery till a dilettanti generation shall take pity on the fallen stones and aspire to re-awaken the symmetrical integrity of an apostolic fane? Possibly to the amateur polemic such a solution may offer the refuge of repose; but not to the champions of truth. These are too ardent in pursuit to acknowledge defeat,—too impatient of a lie to tolerate delay. To men of this stamp, alliance with suspected partisans whose trumpet gives an uncertain sound is synonymous with paralysis. They demand to know whence the fountain of discord first arose?—when and how shall its troubled waters be stilled?

Perhaps the speediest method of answering this question will be to begin by propounding another. Has not the entire train of thought through which we have been now wading betrayed a taint of sophistry arising from the fact that we have been looking at Christianity in the light of a science instead of looking upon human culture in the light of Christianity? What if it should turn out that Christianity is embraced by a formula so brief, simple, and comprehensive, as to be incapable of further definition; and that the everlasting talk in its defence has generally gone hand in hand with the propagation of corruption? What if it should turn out to be susceptible of reduction to no formula whatsoever, but to reside solely in a well-spring of holy thought known only to its docile possessor? Is, or is not, Thomas Carlyle right in representing the Christian religion as having a deeper foundation than books, and as commending itself to the purest nature of man "on far other grounds than

Digitized by Google

Essays on Miracles and by considerations infinitely deeper than would avail in any mere Trial by Jury ?" (*See his Essay on Voltaire.*) Voltaire's main battery was directed, as is well-known, against what theologians have termed "plenary inspiration;" and as to any other objections which may be included in his historical difficulty, the Chelsea sage thus concludes :—" For the rest, the question how Christianity originated is doubtless a high question;—resolvable enough, if we view only its surface, which was all tnat Voltaire saw of it; involved in sacred, silent, unfathomable depths if we investigate its interior meanings; which meanings indeed, it may be, every new age will develop to itself in a new manner and with new degrees of light. For the whole truth may be called infinite, and to man's eye discernible only in parts."—(*Ibid.*)

Here, then, the question with which we started, as to the possibility of further advance, might seem to find its solution. Christianity, we are assured, is to exhibit new expansion in the coming age,—not to undergo a new interpretation, but to carry a broader significance and shed a brighter benison; and one important form of this benison must surely consist in unanimity of design. How all this is to be brought about may not unprofitably constitute our final inquiry; for the net result hitherto discoverable of all the artillery and machinery which have been worked in Christianity's defence is comprised in a chaos of moral belief. The wheels of governmental civilisation may, through the long ages, have been lubricated by the process, and occupation found for the logical and lexical faculties of a hundred rival chairs; but so far as the individual conscience of thinkers was concerned, what else than the aching of dull doubt could in the nature of things be the outcome of Articles of Belief, capacious Bodies of Divinity, exhaustive treatises on the Whole Duty of Man, the organisation and endowment of a privileged order of teachers, and to crown all, the placing of the entire affair under the ægis of the Constable's staff? All this then has seen its day, if we are really to advance. The dead-lock in which so much doctoring and cooking has landed us is a sufficient indication of past failure. But from failure may spring a renewed youth; and we are surely without excuse if, with such a protracted experimental process before our eyes, we cannot now discover the causes of that failure.

To come to the point at once :—We conceive that the gregarious tendency of man has in all ages conspired with his love of ease and self-indulgence to hand over his moral responsibilities to a priestly caste, and thus to do all the most harassing part of his thinking by proxy.—That this emasculating influence has prevailed in Christian as well as in heathen societies.—That in order to maintain themselves in office, the said priestly caste have in many instances corrupted, suppressed, or misinterpreted, the Christian standards.—That when a Faith is valued merely for the support which it renders to a worldly ecclesiastical system, rather than the system valued as the support of the Faith, that Faith is sure to become an instrument of mischief and sooner or later to pronounce its own condemnation.—That all hierarchies have a tendency to mutual support, and are all equally debasing to the community.—That the remedy for these evils lies in the hands of every thinker who has sufficient fortitude to adopt the apostolic maxims, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good, and let each be fully persuaded in his own mind." [*Alford's version.*]

Digitized by Google

—And finally, That in the pursuit of external aids, one of the essential preliminaries is a crucial examination of the Sacred Text.

This then is the office of the journal in which we now write, and a worthier one it is difficult to conceive. We are still of opinion, idolatrous and superstitious though some may deem it, that the Books are an infallible guide; and that everything new and beautiful, and every fresh development of the human conscience even when sublimated to its utmost capacity, can spring from no fountain which does not already sparkle in the sunlight of revelation, had we but eyes to discern it. If a study of the mind of the Spirit at once affectionate, courageous, and devout, such as has hitherto been pursued in these pages, should still result in No Advance, our very faith in "the depths" to which the apostle is ever and anon beckoning us, might stand in danger of an eclipse. On the contrary, that faith has, in numerous aspects, received the unequivocal earnest of a coming harvest. We are conscious of having provoked insatiable inquiry, disturbed many false securities, unearthed many disguises, awakened long-buried hopes, and quickened the aspiration after a more intelligent worship and a more rational service. As the conflict thickens, the sun arises, the shadows flee, and victory points to victory.

"Who loveth Christ, all truth must seek.
Who loveth Christ, all truth must speak.
He shipwreck's Christ's pure Kirk who tries
To anchor it to dreams and lies.
And all who seek to save
Had need be true and brave."* J. WAYLEN.

THE PARABOLIC TRINITY.

I WAS glad to see in the RAINBOW number for December, the subject of the fifteenth chapter of Luke illustrated on the principle advanced by Mr. Maude. There ought to be no question as to its correctness; for, as it treats of the reception of a backsliding child, and the conscious renewal of his relationship with God the Father and the Son, as intimated in verse 2, and particularised in the third element of the parable; it is the scriptural expression of the divine faithfulness and righteousness in responding to the fulness of the work of reconciliation. I have long viewed it in this light, and as I have given the subject no small consideration, I think I may be able to add to, without taking from the interest that Mr. Maude's paper will of course excite.

2. If the text of verse 8 be carefully observed, there will appear but *one parable* in three parts. Unlike the "parables" of Matt. xiii., where each of the four allusions to the development of the Kingdom of Heaven, according to the popular opinion, commences with the words "another parable;" the focus of instruction in "*this parable*" of Luke xv. is concentrated in the third phase, to which the other two are indispensable accessories. Inasmuch, however, as the threefold plies are of

* From a beautiful poem in *Good Words*, styled, "In Dumblane Cathedral," to the memory of Archbishop Leighton. By Walter C. Smith.

Digitized by Google

one "cord that cannot be broken," the remark of Mr. Maude becomes stronger, that "the three together are still one," and that the coalescent action in the three phases of the one parable is that of the Divine Trinity.

3. That the parable is not intended to teach the simple gospel of the atonement, or the regeneration of a sinner by faith in the sacrificial work of Christ, is plain from the names that are bestowed on the object of the story. A "sheep" represents one who belongs to a fold, though he may stray from it, as in the present instance; and a "son" is a member of a father's house and family, though he may become entangled in worldliness and lapse into a state of declension. The person, therefore, contemplated in the instructive lesson before us, is one who was once supposed to have enjoyed the glad knowledge of vicarious atonement, yet owing to the blinding and seductive power of present evil things, his foolish heart became darkened and treacherously oblivious of the privileges of his Father's house, and of his Father's unsearchable love evinced in the price at which his ransom was effected. For this reason, and with the full purpose in love of his ultimate restoration, the Father is at first presented in giving permission to the son to go and reap what the parent well knew would be the bitter fruit of his sin and folly at the merciless hands of the citizen of the world.

4. I must now turn to the second element of this parable in order to illustrate the symbolism of the woman and her action, for I think that Mr. Maude has not caught the meaning of the Lord's language in this section of the divine allegory, though he has given the final cause. There are three figures introduced, the woman, the ten pieces of silver, and the light.

(*a.*) First, of the woman, who generally in Scripture is the personal expression of the condition of man, either good or evil, according to her action. Thus Eve outwardly betrayed the inner state of Adam when she disobediently partook of the fruit of the tree. She was "first in the transgression," and he proved the truth of the principle by doing as she had done. Sarah personified Abraham's state in acting out his falsehood before Pharaoh and Abimelech (Gen. xii. xx.). Miriam's leprosy was the *visible* attestation to the secret condition of Aaron's heart (Num. xii.). Two women symbolise the source and progress of the "wickedness" of men in Zech. v. The woman in Matt. xiii. 33, is actively engaged in a figure representative of the last stage of "the mystery of iniquity," when the fermenting mass of human evil will be ready for "the oven that shall burn it up" (Mal. iv. 1). The woman of Rev. xvii. is the embodiment of the Roman "abominations of the earth," and of "the fornication of the kings of the earth." And, lastly, in wondrous contrast, the "woman clothed with the sun and a crown of twelve stars on her head" (Rev. xii. 1), is "the glory of the man" (1 Cor. xi. 7) "Christ Jesus the Sun of Righteousness and King of Israel." Now the woman in our parable cannot be an exception to these examples. She is surely representative of the condition of the person who is the subject of the parable as he is portrayed in its third phase, as will be apparent presently.

(*b.*) The ten pieces of silver. Here it must be remembered that the Lord was speaking to Hebrews, and consequently that his imagery would be drawn from their Scriptures. In Ex. xxx. we read that Moses was

Digitized by Google

commanded to take from *every individual* Israelite a "ransom price for his soul unto Jehovah." The sum *for each* was "*half-a-shekel*," or ten gerahs ("a shekel being 20 gerahs"). For rich and poor alike this was the fixed sum, for in the matter of redemption God is no respecter *of persons*. The effect of that sacrifice of which the ransom money was the symbol, is "*unto* all, but *upon all who believe*." I think, then, that we have before us in these ten gerahs, the "ten pieces of silver," one of which might easily be supposed to be lost, considering that a gerah weighed but eleven grains; it would, moreover, require diligent search to find it (ver. 8).

I remarked above of the wanderer from the Father's house, that among other cloudings of his spiritual state, he became oblivious of the height and depth of his Father's love, in that he had lost sight of the price that he had paid for the ransom of his soul. He was as one "blinded by the god of this world to the glorious gospel of Christ the Image of God." This younger son once possessed "*ten* pieces of silver;" or, in other words, is supposed in the parable to have been once conscious of his acceptance in the *full value* of the ransom for his soul; but, he "lost one piece!" Thus the whole amount was deteriorated; what once was perfect and soul-satisfying was now imperfect, and required something else to supply its place. Declension had set in; the other nine pieces had not their original importance for lack of the one! One backward slide is not easily recovered, and a complete downfall awaited the young man.

(*c.*) Mark the crisis. The son quits the parent's roof, and is very soon seen joining himself to a citizen of the country to which he had travelled, where *not being acknowledged as a citizen himself*, but an alien, is sent to the menial occupation of feeding swine, and would fain partake of their loathsome food, being destitute and starving. Here he is at the lowest ebb; the chastisement is doing its work. Notwithstanding all, the Father's eye and heart have never once left or forsaken this wayward child since he quitted the house. His spirit followed him, watched him, mourned over him; but *there was no interference till the last stage of misery had been reached;* when THE LIGHT of remembrance was permitted to flash before him, and he was at once humbled to the dust! Diligently then by the aid of the Divine Light of THE SPIRIT OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON, did he set to work to disencumber himself of those things, that like false lights had allured only to deceive. The rubbish was swept away, and lo! the "lost piece of silver is recovered." This is the point of time at which we obtain the lesson, that by the Light of the Holy Spirit, *the fulness* of returning consciousness of the Father's unquenchable love in the gift of *such* a ransom as had been paid for His child by the sacrifice of His well-beloved Son, and of the Son's love in willingly surrendering himself an offering for sin, calls forth the determination to return. He has "come to *himself*," to the full knowledge of the position that grace had given him. He must quit the country to which he is a stranger, and go to his father in humble confession of having so ill requited the love wherewith he had been loved. Such love, he feels persuaded demands a full return in the willing offer of body, soul, and spirit. No longer "conformed to this world, but transformed by the renewing of his mind into a living sacrifice, a reasonable service." **(Rom. xii. 1, 2.)**

Digitized by Google

5. In order to connect the first element of the parable, it must be added, that the Son of God is ever at the right hand of the Father pleading his priceless sacrifice on behalf of all erring *children;* to which the faithfulness and justice *of God* to the advocacy of his Son righteously urged on the ground of his glorifying work, ever responds; that the children may not only be forgiven on confession and repentance, but "cleansed from all unrighteousness," restored to all the privileges of the father's house and table, and the renewed assurance of a father's love. (1 John i. 9; ii. 1.)

Furthermore, the shoulder of the Son as the Great High Priestly Intercessor is that which sustains the children of God under all circumstances of their infirmities and weakness (Exod. xxviii. 9-12; Levit. vii. 32-34); their strength is perfected in that shoulder which bears them before a Throne of GRACE that they may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need. (2 Cor. xii. 9; Heb. iv. 15, 16.)

The sheep wearied with wanderings has but to bleat, when the Good Shepherd's heart responds at once to the cry, and his shoulder ever acts in harmony with his heart.

How wonderful, and yet how divine, that God should lay the foundation of "joy in heaven" in the exhibition of grace and mercy. What a dreadfully Satanic spirit was that of the Pharisees who made it an objection! H. GOODWYN.

SUGGESTIVE HINTS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

THERE has seldom or ever, with but few exceptions, been a more important crisis in human affairs than that which now exists upon the Eastern Question.

Surely the prophecies of Scripture contain some allusion to the crisis?

"God" has said (Amos iii. 7), "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."

Let us refer to his servants, the prophets, Zechariah and Ezekiel.

Reading the whole of the first chapter of Zechariah and considering the last four verses; let us ask, who are they who in these days are the representatives of the "four horns" which have scattered Judah, Israel, and Jerusalem. Are they not the Turks who have succeeded to the possessions of the four little horns, explained in Daniel viii. 22, to be those who subdivided among them the empire of Grecia upon the death of Alexander the Great?

And referring to verse 20 (Zech. i.): Who are the four carpenters come to fray the four horns? May they not be the four revolted provinces, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Servia? whose proceedings having considerably frayed the Turkish Power, tend ultimately, the Times of the Gentiles having expired, to cast out the "horns of the Gentiles which lifted up their horns, their power, over the land of Judah to scatter it."

Again, in the sixth chapter of Zechariah we have a vision of four

Digitized by Google

chariots – possibly warlike powers—seen "coming out from between two mountains of brass."

Are these mountains emblematic of Governments? Is not brass the emblem of the ancient Greek, now modern Turkish Empire?—as by the received interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's great vision in the Book of Daniel (ii. 39). European Turkey being now divided into two leading governments—the Porte and the rebel principalities. The interpretation of this vision is as yet obscure: but should Servia and Bulgaria come under Russian occupatian, and Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Austrian, then the Black horses of the vision being the two former, their going towards the north country would quiet Russia for a season, as hinted at in verse eight of chapter the sixth. After that, as by verse ten &c., we may hear of the return of the Jews to the Holy Land, under British or French auspices.

Turn we now to Ezekiel's visions as detailed in the ninth chapter thereof: Those visions as by the seventh chapter (second, third, fifth, and sixth verses), referring to "*the end*" of this dispensation.

In the ninth chapter, verse 1, may not the "loud voice" calling attention to the Eastern Question, be the Servian War?

May not "the city" be a type of the Continent of Europe?

Are the six armed men, having charge over the Continent, caused to draw near or come into conference at the higher gate of the Mediterranean which looks toward the north (viz. Constantinople on the Bosphorus), the six powers—France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Russia, Turkey? all armed for war. Is the seventh man among them, clothed with linen with a writer's inkhorn by his side, the representative of Great Britain, as a Protestant Nation with a free press? What means the brazen altar by which the seven men stand? Can it be that centre of false religion, i.e., Mohammedanism at the originally Greek city, Constantinople?

Supposing these views to be correct: has not the British Ambassador gone "through the midst of the city"—the Continent—visiting Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Rome, to meet the Russians and the Turk at Constantinople?

Hereafter we may learn after what fashion he has fulfilled the fourth verse of the ninth chapter, while the other six Powers are told to "go after him through the city and smite." (Verse 6.) Slaughter is to commence "at the ancient men which were before the house." Can "the house" denote the actual city, Jerusalem? And if disarmament of the Mussulmen takes place on the threatened occupation of Bulgaria, may we not very possibly expect a sudden massacre of Jews and Christians at Jerusalem?

In hinting at these fearful possibilities what remains?—

Verse 11: "And behold the man clothed with linen which had the inkhorn by his side, reported the matter, saying, I have done as thou hast commanded me." May "the Lord of Hosts" so prosper the words and actions of our Government through its Ambassador, as that he in summing up our national procedure at this wondrous Conference of the Continental Powers, may truly have the satisfaction of saying simply and most reverently, as in the very presence of God, "I have done as Thou hast commanded me."

Wimbledon. J. Scott Phillips.

Digitized by Google

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

ARTICLE I.

OUT of *forty-four* psalms containing imprecations, or petitions for evil to befall the enemies of the psalmist, and exultations when the heart's desire has been gratified, it is agreed that some *twenty-two* are undoubtedly the composition of David, while of *eight* others the strongest presumptions respecting the authorship point in the same direction.

If, therefore, we would rightly estimate these portions of the sacred writings, and ascertain the amount of claim they possess to be regarded as revelations of the divine character, will, and purpose; we should attentively consider the times in which David lived, the Scriptures and religion of his age, and the manner of man he was, in so far as the inspired records throw light upon these particulars.

David's Bible consisted of the Pentateuch, and the books of Job, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth; doubtless, also, he was acquainted with the contemporary records of Samuel; but what was of more importance, he himself made much of the history which Samuel preserved. Such, and no more, was the written and external revelation vouchsafed to David, and who can doubt that many a time the soul of the sweet psalmist of Israel pined on account of its insufficiency, and hungered after a fuller, brighter manifestation of that great Supreme in whom he confided with so profound a trust, and who was more real to him than Zion's hill or all the floods of ungodly men which made him afraid.

Who can doubt that he lived constantly in the conviction that the Scriptures of his day were only preludes to larger unveilings and clearer revelations of God's will, which after ages of greater privilege would assuredly enjoy; or that the hope which burned in his silent breast accredited him to take rank with that exalted company who in their typical lives, and God-breathed utterances, were destined to find, in part, an answer to their own expectations, while they added to that which had already been revealed, and fostered stronger longings in following generations.

With ardour and delight would the youthful David peruse the traditions of his race, and with kindling presentiments that he himself was to make a conspicuous figure in the continued history. Glorious in their tragic depth and dramatic incident were those Scriptures, and interpenetrated with God as the body of a man with his soul. But what a God! Perplexingly unequal in his ways, apparently changeful in his temper and hasty in his judgments. Long suffering, and abrupt indiscriminate wrath, equally characterising his administration. Then, as now, man appeared better than God, and by presenting the verdicts of justice and sober judgment, then, not as now, man succeeded in altering God's determinations. A grievous puzzle this still to Christians, who forget how often in the days of their pupilage teacher momentarily changed places with scholar, purposely making mistakes, in order to have the gratification of discovering how readily the scholar could correct them. Thus does God still disguise Himself, and delights in those children who have learnt enough to be sure of the disguise.

And the God of these Scriptures seemed to be requiring more from the world, and to be visiting it more sternly with retributions the older it grew.

Digitized by Google

For 2,000 years before the flood he winked at its vicious life, but then awoke to deal with the descendants of many corrupted generations, far differently from the manner in which he dealt with Adam and Cain,—young from the heavenly nurture of Eden, and the blissful tales of the sorrowing mother of mankind. The Patriarchs, selected for promises, were inheritors of penalties as well, and in due time their descendants stand manacled and trembling at the base of Sanai, riveted in bondage to an irksome law which was only broken to incur a curse.

And holy, just and good as was the moral law, the ceremonial was not only grievous but bloody. Both priests and people were committed to the actual slaying of animals when engaged in the highest offices of religion. But indeed in pastoral Israel every man was of necessity his own butcher, and ran into the herd to slay before he sat down with his guests. A boy like Samuel, therefore, entering the service of the priesthood from his youth would be as familiar with blood as a Roman Catholic acolyte with incense, and fired with a holy zeal for obedience, consuming every other feeling, could readily hew Agag in pieces before the Lord. Such a people, inured also to battle and hardship in the wilderness, were well fitted to act as the slayers of the Canaanites, whose land was ready to spue them forth on account of their filthy naughtiness. David knew that the land was theirs to whom the Lord had given it, and that the appointed executioners of divine vengeance upon a guilty race were his own nation, whose destiny was ruthlessly to exterminate and completely to possess. It was 500 years since the judgment that had long slumbered as before the flood, awoke upon the devoted people, and still the promise and the destiny were unfulfilled. Doubtless the young shepherd pondered it many times with troubled spirit, and burned to deliver his people from the galling yoke which in borders of Philistia compelled every man to go down to the heathen enemy in order to sharpen his coulter or his goad. His ardent admiration would be given to the heroes and heroines who had distinguished themselves, whether in fair fight, or in abominable treachery, as the champions of Israel. The times favoured this worship of the warlike. Israel was embedded amongst enemies. The Jebusites still held the future capital. The Hittites were in Ephraim; Ammon, Moab, Edom, and Amalek threatened the borders, and the Philistines, unremitting in hostility, were the habitual scourges of the conquerors.

Pent up in the corners of the land, and distressed by the growth of population, these remnants of the ancient occupiers were urged by hunger as well as by hatred when they burst in upon the territory of their fathers, and sought to rescue the cities, the vineyards, and the wells for which the Israelites had not toiled. As on the one hand the child of Abraham fed his imagination with the high destinies of his race, so on the other the heathen handed it down from father to son as a sacred legacy to avenge themselves upon the exterminating hosts. Such was the land of promise—the rest that remained for the people of God. Five hundred years had elapsed, and the thorns were still in their sides. "Lord, how long?" Until Israel is more zealous for righteousness than for dominion. Until she is girded with the strength of holiness. But nothing was clearer to David's mind than that the enemies of Israel were the enemies of the Lord. Notwithstanding his descent from Moab it was

Digitized by Google

plain as the shadow of his staff, that God's face was light towards Israel and darkness upon all her borders. Jehovah *was* a respecter of persons —that was the dearest truth stamped upon the pages of his Bible—and he exulted in the fact that the Lord's enemies were his own. To slaughter the Philistines was not only patriotism but religion. To show mercy was to be ungodlike; to cut off every thing that breathed—man, woman, and sucking child, oxen, sheep, camel, and ass—this was to be heavenly-minded. By thus being commissioned to destroy property as well as persons, it was made clear that the judgment was not executed to feed a pet people with spoil, but to score into their hearts God's abomination of iniquity. And the adoption of such laws of war, in a country where war was chronic, was an ordination full of mercy. When races hate one another and the parents of the weaker are slain, to give the babes quick despatch at the same time is clemency itself. There was sore war against the Philistines all the days of Saul, and afterwards there was long war between the house of Saul and the house of David. The practices of war with the heathen begot a fierce spirit which flamed up upon the slightest provocation. Thus David would have slain every son and servant belonging to Nabal in his anger at being refused an invitation to dinner. He went in and out upon his raids beating down the people who cried and there was none to save them, casting them out as dirt, and washing his footsteps in their blood, with the indifference of a wild beast. It was God who had taught his hands to war and his fingers to fight, even as he had given jaw teeth to the lion and claws to the tiger. It was in such an epoch of the world's development that God was educating his church. The hand of the great Potter must needs be soiled with the clay he works in. To temper the laws of war towards the heathen would have caused Israel to mistake the import of the Divine decree, besides frustrating the high purpose of making room for righteousness. And while warlike prowess, always the first idol of youth and of immature nations, became the adoration of Israel, at the same time piety of a deep, stern, and terribly earnest character was begotten out of circumstances in which men balanced the chances of life and death continually. "Enemies" were in a manner in the air, but also God was everywhere. Saul was to David an object of genuine worship, he admired his valour and he reverenced him as the Lord's anointed. More than that, a singular bond of sympathy must have been established between them, when David beheld the spirit leave the disturbed countenance of the King and a smile of serene peace and gratitude greet the happy harper. It did not awaken anger, it rather deepened worship when the javelin of Saul flew past him to the wall, for the very basis of worship is the conviction that one's life is helplessly in the hands of the king.

Jonathan's love David rather received than reciprocated. It was Saul, who had sought to kill him and whose life he had so often spared, whom David's prosperity was to unseat from the kingdom,—it was Saul's death that he lamented with passionate regrets, in the heat of which his love for Jonathan glowed with an intensity that lovely youth had never seen in life.

Sure always of this high destiny, yet determined never to anticipate his hour by unlawful means; submitting himself to that mysterious will, which after anointing him king made his way to the kingdom not a whit

Digitized by Google

the easier on that account, appearing indeed perpetually to thwart rather than to further the purpose of the anointing; allowing him to be hunted like a partridge on the mountains—involving him in difficulties and extremities while yet the destiny was charged if possible with greater certainty than pertains to natural law—let David's example and experiences rebuke the faint-heartedness of Christians who in dark hours of conflict for the truth wonder if Christ really is God's anointed to the kingdom and supremacy.

Then, as now, and always, there were found adherents of the true and of the false. David and Saul were signs unto which gathered the sympathies of the temporisers, the worldly wise, the self-dependent on the one hand; and of the worldly foolish, the spiritual, the faith-upheld upon the other. It was indeed lamentable weakness which led David to accept the succour of the wretched Adullamites. They were no true representatives of his real party in the state and only brought his cause into disrepute. A great part of his troubles and temptations arose from this leaning upon an arm that was not God's. But what precious lessons do we learn from our errors! How strong was the recoil, how deep was the thirst after God, begotten by his association with fraudulent debtors, scape-graces, speculators for honours in his kingdom,—lawless and turbulent spirits, many of these doubtless often plotting to sell him to Saul, —and how greatly were his talents for government developed, and his fidelity to righteousness tested when restraining men whose real attachment was to a captain of banditti, and not to a psalm-singing king. And when he fled to Achish—another piece of weakness bringing on new trouble—what floods of light, what questionings of soul would pour in in consequence of his honourable treatment and of the insight he obtained into the common sympathies, the common difficulties and disabilities, the common subjection to unseen powers of evil, and the individual examples of nobleness and virtue which he found existing among a people who were appointed to die without being allowed that knowledge of God which he himself possessed. Was the Great One to come after him, to extend his kingdom over such as they?—not over deserts where extermination had made a lasting peace, but over the fruitful lands of pious, prosperous, and in the best sense, progressive peoples?

And yet his conscience was marvellously undeveloped, sensitive beyond measure to acts of treachery committed among his own people, and especially upon warriors, remembering to his dying day the sly poke by which Joab revenged upon Abner a brother's blood, he yet scrupled not to give orders that the lame and blind should be especially devoted to destruction in the capture of Jerusalem from the Jebusites. The case of Uriah, had he been a Jew and not a Hittite, would scarcely have been proof of a permanent discord in David's character, for never do we see a great breadth of human excellence displayed, but more than once in its unfolding, as in the spectrum, a line of darkness cuts it through. But one thing is clearly manifest in David,—he has no adequate conception of his own imperfections, nor any suggestions recommending his enemies to mercy. His denunciations are utterly without discrimination—there is no light and shadow in his condemnation—all his foes alike are of one colour—black as Erebus. Hence before God he magnifies his own righteousness, and also before God calls down equal and indiscriminate

Digitized by Google

retribution not only upon the authors of the evil which afflicts him, but also upon their innocent descendants to remote posterity; and what I would beg the reader to notice is that he had warrant for this in the imperfect revelation of God then made. He was innocent of the oppressive weight of the "new" commandment. Outside of Israel was nothing to him. He never stopped to ponder conditions of human growth and development; why and how the thing that is became what it is,—the complex but incontestable influence of ancestry, parentage, moral atmosphere, spiritual darkness or twilight, physical constitution and necessities of living. The sermon on the mount would have slain him, but without it he was "alive," even when his cruelty was horrible.

His usual barbarity when warring against the heathen, and his imprecations in the psalms, will enable us to accept as literally true the account given of his conduct to the inhabitants of Rabbah, who, politically speaking, had only been guilty of patriotism. Pity he could feel, and divine resentment against merciless oppression, as when Nathan's parable prepared the way for his profound repentance, but that was a case supposed to be in Israel; whereas Rabbah was given to Israel as prey to a beast of prey. His magnanimity was noble, each one who thought to pave an avenue to his favour by privately making away with his enemies, met with the swift retribution they deserved, but it was also sullied by cruelty, for if the Amalekite's story had been true, he had been merciful in granting the hapless petition of Saul to have his agonies put an end to. Truly did Shimei curse him as a man of blood, and the sword did not depart from his house in consequence. Disgusting and not to be mentioned among us, as was the number of his wives and concubines, that was not made the ground of his disability to build the temple, for God makes large concessions to the saints in the years of the Church's pupilage; but it was because he was a man of blood he must not build. And age did not mellow his disposition or expand his sympathies, neither did the profound exercises of spirit that ensued upon his deep and towering crime. It was in the siege of Rabbah that Uriah fell. Religion came and met him on the spiritual plane in which his age and the Church's age had placed him, and to him all his own enemies were the enemies of God. Innocently he makes sure of this, and so long as he is sure of it his denunciations are justifiable and his cruelties meritorious. Hence he can exultingly say, "I did beat them as small as the dust of the earth, I did stamp them as the mire of the street, and did spread them abroad." Now what is done in self-defence is no criterion of character, and when our fellow Christians in New Zealand shoot down Maories like cattle, they are not to be judged thereby, but when the siege is over and the wretched inhabitants are brought forth, —then we see character consenting to supposed religious duty, when David put the people of Rabbah under saws and under harrows of iron, and made them pass through the brick kiln; and *thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon.*

But ere he dies let us look at him once again in his blooming youth, ruddy and of a beautiful countenance, before the rust of age had dimmed every lustre he possessed. Much as he is given to war and in sympathy with warriors, he is also poet and musician, and before all things God's anointed. Greatness was thrust upon him, he sought it not. He never

Digitized by Google

planned or plotted for the throne. He met the exigencies of each hour as burdened with its duty and its trial, and let God drift him as sticks are drifted on a stream, with many a stoppage and many a turn, to the place of final anchorage. He is overpowered with a delightful sense of fellowship with God. He is making history for myriads of weeping eyes to the world's end. He acts like one who is drunk with inspiration. His kingly trappings seem to separate him from the main stay of his life. He will cast down his crown and strip himself to the ignominious dance that God may be honoured by his self-abasement, while he is strengthened by realising his dependence. Of course he is a wonder unto many, and all men who live in a lofty spiritual region of necessity must be. His aspirations were singly Godward, and the blame of God shrunk the sinews of his soul, so that he crept from Jerusalem oppressed with His disfavour, when Absalom threw stones at his heart, as Shimei at his person, "cursing as he went." And even when the end had come, the light and darkness of his imperfectly developed religious consciousness contended for the mastery. "David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised upon high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet Psalmist of Israel, said, The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue: He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning when the sun riseth, even as a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain. Although my house be not so with God; yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure: for this is all my salvation and my desire, although he make it not to grow." (2 Sam. xxiii. 1-5.)

Yet the same tongue gives directions for Solomon to cut off men whom he was afraid to touch himself, and whom he had sworn should live. It was on account of no personal affront that his faithful captain of the host was appointed to die, whose advice, if followed, would have saved him from numbering Israel and from a pestilence immediately spoiling the census. It was a zeal for righteousness, as Joab was guilty of one murder from ambition, but anyhow it is a miserable spectacle, David on his death-bed leaving such a legacy to a man who would mourn heavily over him. Worse, however, is the wretched subterfuge by which he thinks to destroy Shimei while saving his word of honour, as if it made any difference whether he or Solomon executed a decree originating with himself. Such was the man who wrote most of the Imprecatory Psalms.

* HENRY DEACON.

(To be continued.)

MAN GIVETH UP THE GHOST, AND WHERE IS HE?

JOB XIV.

I AM unable to agree with "Fidus," that the language of Job in this chapter is that of "midnight despondency and despair." In verses 13-15, hope shines out distinct and visible; and in chapter xix. his triumphant assurance is placed beyond doubt. And although in chapter xiv. he states that "there is hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will

Digitized by Google

sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease:" and then asks the question, "If a man die, will he live again?" I cannot regard it as expressive of doubt, but rather as a challenge to his three friends who had come avowedly to comfort, but who in reality only stung him with taunts and reproaches. On their arrival—perceiving his deep affliction and excessive grief—they sat down with him upon the ground, seemingly in mute astonishment and dismay, and dared not even to break the silence until Job's wail of lamentation that "light should be given to him that is in misery, and life unto the bitter of soul, who long for death," did so, and paved the way for them to answer. Among the first utterances of Eliphaz—the first speaker—we find the key to all the speeches of Job's three friends. It is manifest that they were not deficient in the reasoning faculty, but their field of vision was limited to the life that now is; and all their arguments were based on what they regarded as the experience and observation of past, and then present generations. They acknowledged God, and contended that he was just in all his ways: hence, after Job's wail, "When I say my bed shall comfort me, my couch shall ease my complaint; then thou scarest me with dreams, and terrifiest me through visions; so that my soul chooseth strangling, and death rather than life. I loathe it; I would not live alway;" Bildad replies, "Doth God pervert judgment? or doth the Almighty pervert justice? If thou wert pure and upright, surely now he would awake for thee, and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous" (chapters vii. and viii). Like Elihu, considering that "Days should speak, and multitude of years teach wisdom," they had great confidence in the experience and wisdom of the ancients and the aged. "For inquire, I pray thee, of the former age, and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers. (For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days on earth are a shadow.") (viii. 7.) The speech of Job in chapter xiv., however, was evidently felt by his friends as the wound of a barbed arrow, and their chagrin is evinced in the petulant retort of Eliphaz: "Art thou the first man that was born? or wast thou made before the hills? Hast thou heard the secret of God? and dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself? What knowest thou, that we know not? what understandest thou, which is not in us? With us are both the grey-headed and very aged men, much elder than thy father." (xv. 7-10.)

They confidently affirmed, however, that the experience of all past ages testified, and that they themselves had seen it verified, that prosperity or adversity was meted out to man by God according as a man was righteous or wicked. "Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment?" (Eliphaz in xv. 4.) "Hast thou marked the old way which wicked men have trodden? which were cut down out of time, whose foundation was overflown with a flood?" "Remember, I pray thee, who ever perished, being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off? Even as I have seen, they that plow iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same. By the blast of God they perish, and by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed." "Lo this, we have searched it; so it is; hear it, and know thou it for thy good." (Eliphaz in xxii. 15, iv. 7, and v. 27.) The only "good" that they

Digitized by Google

contemplated for Job, however, was, that by returning to God, his worldly prosperity would return to him. "If thou return to the Aimighty, thou shalt be built up, thou shalt put away iniquity far from thy tabernacles. Then shalt thou lay up gold as dust, and the gold of Ophir as the stones of the brooks. Yea, the Almighty shall be thy defence, and thou shalt have plenty of silver." (xxii. 23.)

Viewing Job's case then in the light of their philosophy, although no sin committed by Job had ever come to their knowledge, yet, regarding the measure of his affliction as the true index to the extent of his iniquity, they accused him of having transgressed against God, in like degree as he had been afflicted. In replying, Job had to meet them on their own grounds, and repel their insinuations and accusations against him. In doing so, he found, not only their conclusions at fault, but "falsehood" in their premises. As antagonistic to their theory, he affirms, "This is one thing, therefore I said it, he afflicteth the upright as well as the wicked." And in chapter xxi. he fairly meets them with counter experiences. "Wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea are mighty in power? Their seed is established in their sight with them, and their offspring before their eyes. Their houses are safe from fear, neither is the rod of God upon them. They experience no adversity in life, and feel no pang even in death. They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave: therefore they (the wicked) say unto God, Depart from us; for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. What is the Almighty, that we should serve him? and what profit should we have if we pray unto him?" Here Job most conclusively demonstrates the fallacy of the position taken by his friends, and then asks them, "How then comfort ye me in vain, seeing in your answers there remaineth falsehood?" But when he propounds his question, "If a man die, shall he live again?" and afterward avers, "That the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction, and shall be brought forth to the day of wrath," to be repaid "what he hath done;" he treads upon ground never "dreamed of in their philosophy;" and never explored in all the researches of the "grey-headed and very aged men," on whose wisdom and understanding Job's friends had so much relied. But his triumphant argument only reaches its climax in that glorious outburst of poetic eloquence in chapter xxviii. "Surely there is a vein for the silver, and a place of gold where they fine it. Iron is taken out of the earth, and brass is molten out of the stone." "But where shall wisdom be found? and where the place of understanding? which the gold and crystal cannot equal: and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels of fine gold. Man knoweth not the price thereof, neither is it found in the land of the living." But, "There is a path which no fowl knoweth, and which the vulture's eye hath not seen: the lion's whelps have not trodden it, nor the fierce lion passed by it." "God alone understandeth the way thereof, and he knoweth the place thereof: And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding."

Here Job's friends were completely brought to bay. "They answered no more." A man, by diligent search, may find out the secret place of the precious metals; and experience and observation have laid a good foundation for "hope that the cut down tree," by a refreshing stream,

Digitized by Google

"will sprout again;" and that "the tender branch thereof will not cease to spring from the stump left in the ground." "But man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Ay, "Where is he?" Where in the experience, observations, and researches of the wise of all ages has there been found any ground to hope that man, like the cut down tree, still retains vitality? or any voice to answer the question:

> "Shall spring ever visit the mouldering urn?
> Shall day ever dawn on the night of the grave?"

"The depth saith, It is not in me; and the sea saith, It is not in me." No! Creation's ample storehouse will liberally reward the diligent searcher after her hidden treasures: but there is no handwriting upon creation's walls, and no voice comes from her secret chambers to answer the great question, "If a man die, shall he live again?" The astronomer cannot find it in the starry heights; nor the geologist in the rocky depths; the philosopher and preacher of Ecclesiastes gave his heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things done under heaven; but after every effort he declares the search to be in vain; for, as far as can be learned, "there is nothing better for a man than to eat and drink, and enjoy the fruit of his labour all the days of his life, for that is his portion; and no man can tell what shall come after." This then is all that unaided philosophy can do for man; for "what can the man do that cometh after the king? even that which hath been already done." The preacher is entirely at one with Job in affirming that there is "one event to the righteous and the wicked," and consequently against the philosophy of Job's friends, that adversity and affliction are the portion only of the wicked. But he goes even further and affirms that, so far as the events and occurrences of life are concerned, there is no evidence that a man hath any "pre-eminence above a beast;" "for that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts: even one thing befalleth them." In life, "they have all one breath" (or spirit), and in death there is no *visible* distinction. "As the one dieth, so dieth the other; all go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." The preacher, however, was not unaware of contrary conclusions. He evidently expected an objection to be raised, and a claim put in, for the "survival of spirit life" for man after death: but he meets this with a question similar to that of Job's,—Who knoweth? "Who knoweth the spirit of man whether it goeth upward, or the spirit of the beast whether it goeth downward to the earth?" (Eccles. iii. 19, Bible with emendations.) In their origin, in their life, in their death, and in their return to dust, the philosopher finds the man and the beast the same! and what may follow afterward "is hid from the eyes of all living." All honour to the men of philosophy and science in their commendable efforts to bring to light the hidden secrets of nature. "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing; but the honour of kings is to search out a matter!" But let them know that those questions dearest to the heart of man—What am I? and whence came I? What shall be my ultimate existence?—find no answer in their field of research. Nay! even although their search should be extended to regions the most remote ever visited by fowl of fleetest wing, or seen by the piercing eye

Digitized by Google

of the far-seeing vulture, philosophy and science are unavailing here. Such seems to be the testimony of both Job and the preacher: and the testimony of another no less illustrious may be added: "Eye hath not seen," says Paul, "nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us (the apostles) by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God." (See 1 Cor. i. and ii.) Paul's "wise men after the flesh," and his "natural man, who receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," I apprehend are the same, and belong to the same class as Job's three friends; a class to whom "The heavens may declare the glory of God, and the firmament show his handywork;" but whose ears are not open to the revelations of his prophets and apostles, "who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit;" and revealed "the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."

Paul asks, "Where is the wise? where is the disputer of this world?" Ay, where? Where they were in the days of Paul, they were in the days of Job. And where are they now? Groping blindly among apes for the origin of man; and leaving him, without hope, among worms in the end. "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" asks Paul. "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth," says Jesus, "because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

For the benefit of others, the preacher of Ecclesiastes gives the legitimate conclusions to which "the wisdom of this world" leads. And, apart from the wisdom that cometh from God,—not through his works, but through his word,—it is summed up in "Vanity and vexation of spirit:" but, like Job, he had learned the source of true "wisdom and understanding," and hence he concludes his book. "Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

Cupar. J. Mill.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE STATE OF THE DEAD.

Dear Sir,—Allow me to make a few remarks on Mr. Constable's letter on "the state of the dead." (Rainbow for 1876, p. 561.) It is in reply to mine in November, and specially to that part of it in which I make use of Acts xxiii. 8, 9, and John viii. 56, as against those who hold not merely the unconscious state, but the nonentity of the dead.

I confessed my inability to distinguish between that opinion and that of the Sadducees in their denial of the existence of spirits as distinct from their kindred denial of the existence of angels. Mr. Constable says that he does not deny "the existence of man's spirit in the disembodied state." But then he considers this as something which "belonged to God's own nature, coming forth from Him,

Digitized by Google

and going back to Him at His will;" and, of course, in the case of the dead, gone back to him as fully and finally as in the case of the beasts that perish or of those who are annihilated in the second death. I expressly supposed (p. 520) that the Sadducees denied neither the existence of spirit in the living man, nor the existence of God as a spirit.

What did St. Luke mean to tell us that the Sadducees denied in saying there is no spirit, no resurrection, and no angel? I gather from what Mr. Constable says on Acts xxiii. 9, and from his quotation from Poole, that he considers St. Luke to have meant that they held there was no resurrection, no angel, nor (as meant by the word "spirit") any "prophetical revelation," or "spirit of prophecy," no "Divine spirit of God in any way making known to man the mind and will of God." But surely the Sadducees did not deny that God spake unto Moses at the bush, on Mount Sinai, or elsewhere. If they did they would never have been put to silence by our Lord's argument for the resurrection, built altogether as it was on the supposition as common ground to him and them that God spake to Moses at the bush.

But I think there is proof positive in Acts xxiii. 8, that St. Luke did not take this view of the "spirit." I allude to his use of τα ἀμφότερα, "both," by which he evidently classified the three subjects of their denial into two. To use Alford's words, "τὰ αμφ is used of both things, the one being the resurrection, the other the doctrine of spiritual existences; the two specified classes of the latter being combined generically." I think, therefore, it cannot be doubted, that "spirit" means a spiritual existence such as would be classed generically with "angel."

As to verse 9, and what the Pharisees meant when they spoke of the possibility of a spirit or an angel having spoken to Paul; surely this must be governed by what is the true meaning of those words "spirit" and "angel" in verse 8. There is extreme probability in Alford's suggestion that, "Perhaps in this they referred to the history of his conversion as told to the people," chap. xxii. This would strongly confirm my view of the whole passage, that they considered it possible that the spirit of the crucified Jesus had spoken to Paul. In any case they expressed, as against the Sadducees their belief in the existence of such a spirit as might, in the same way as an angel, have spoken to Paul.

But Mr. Constable thinks "this opinion of spirits" "strikingly similar to that of modern spiritualism," and that I myself agree with it. I have no liking for the company of spiritualists. Even if I believed with the Pharisees that the spirits of the departed could and sometimes did by God's permission appear to and communicate with men, that would not put me among the spiritualists. As the differential essence of their system, spiritualists are guilty of necromancy, i.e., seeking to the dead.

Mr. Constable says that "the conveying of communications to living men by disembodied spirits of men, is not only ignored, but is contradicted in Scripture from first to last." But what does he mean by this? Does he mean that the fact of such conveying is ignored and contradicted? All that could be reasonably said is, that no such

Digitized by Google

fact is recorded in Scripture, which might be true if 1 Samuel xxviii. formed no part of Scripture. To say that the possibility is either ignored or contradicted is, I think, not the case. So far from its being ignored, it is plainly implied in the seeking to the dead being forbidden.

He says again, "Our Lord has taught us that for any communication to pass between the living and the dead, it would be necessary for the latter to be raised from the dead" (Luke xvi. 27-31). This may be an inference from our Lord's words; but it is certainly not their direct teaching. All, according to the parable, are in the disembodied state; as Abraham testifies, not yet raised from the dead. The rich man first asks Abraham to send Lazarus with some comfort to himself. That Abraham says is an impossibility because of the great gulf fixed between. There is no thought of resurrection here. He next asks that Lazarus should be sent to testify to his brethren in his father's house. This request is also refused on the ground that the granting of it would be useless. The rich man urges the request, still without any word or thought of resurrection. Abraham to convince him of the utter uselessness of the suggested mission answers in effect, that though even a greater wonder took place, and one rose from the dead, the five brethren would not be persuaded. This passage bears strong testimony to the conscious existence of disembodied spirits in Hades, endorsing with our Lord's sanction the commonly received Jewish opinion to that effect.

I quoted Luke xxiv. 37 and 39, as another instance of what St. Luke meant by "spirit" in ver. 8 of that chapter, and of what was believed in by all the Jews except the Sadducees and their disciples.

And now, as to John viii. 56. I do not see why Mr. Constable should be surprised at my agreement with Alford as to the meaning of this verse. We both give very good reasons for our opinion respecting it, and our objections to the non-literal rendering of it in the authorised version. He argues that, "if our Lord had meant to say" something slightly different from what we suppose him to have said or meant, he would have expressed himself differently. But, supposing that he meant to say just what he did, viz., that Abraham rejoiced (at one time) that he should see his day, and that he did see it and was glad, what is there unreasonable in that? If I were to say that the late Duke of Wellington rejoiced once in hope that he should see Napoleon's banishment from Europe, and that he did see it after all when it happened, and was glad—would there not be sufficient sense and meaning in that, without my speaking of his continued joy in the duration of the Emperor's exiled life? There was much that had happened during the day of Christ, which would not have made Abraham glad had he seen it, but that the day of Christ was come, and to see it come, were a cause of gladness to him. The verse literally rendered is, "Your father Abraham rejoiced that he should see my day, and he saw it, and was glad." The authorised version and Mr. Constable's interpretation of it, lose sight of the ἵνα, make the verb εἴδω, occuring twice in the one short verse, have a different meaning in each place (at least, if ἵνα ἴδῃ is at all rightly translated), i.e., "see," in one place, and "foresee," in the other, and involves tautology.

Digitized by Google

How or how much the blessed dead are given to see or know is not revealed. That they "know not anything" is contrary to Scripture. This is not the meaning of Eccles. ix. 8. I believe, with Mr. White, that "such language which plainly refers only to the interruption of all the *active* purposes and schemes of embodied life," is not "to be taken metaphysically to describe the condition of departed spirits."

Though the few passages I have quoted and alluded to in this and my former paper have much weight to my mind in favour of the conscious existence of disembodied spirits, I am far from thinking them the plainest or the weightiest. The teaching of 2 Cor. v. 1-3, of Phil. i. 20-25, of Luke xxiii. 42, 43, of Matt. x. 28, and 1 Peter iii. 19, is decisive to my mind on the subject. At the same time, it seems to me a very fair ground on which to discuss it and to settle it is indicated by the following questions: 1. What was the view of this matter prevalent among the Jews of our Lord's day? i.e., Did they or did they not believe in the conscious existence of disembodied spirits? 2. Was this one matter of controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees? If so, into which scale do the inspired writers of the New Testament throw the weight of their authority? 3. If the Pharisees and the orthodox Jews believed in the conscious existence of departed spirits, was that belief allowed, or disallowed, promoted or discouraged by such New Testament Scriptures as I have just mentioned?

It is a great grief to me to differ in such a matter as this with those to whose powerful advocacy all believers in the non-eternity of torment owe so much. I allude to yourself, and very especially to Mr. Constable. I wish from my heart we were all agreed. Till we are, however, we can I hope, love and respect each other, and, at the same time, discuss the matter thoroughly.*

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,
W. J. Hobson.
St. Barnabas Vicarage.

A LIBEL ON KING DAVID.

Dear Sir, — Our translators have made King David a monster of cruelty in the conquest of Rabbah. In 2 Sam. xii. 31, they tell us that "he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick-kiln;" and in 1 Chron. xx. 3, we read, "he brought out the people that were in it, and cut them with saws, and with harrows of iron, and with axes."

Now, can this be true? The destruction of the vile idolaters of Canaan was commanded, but horrible torture of this kind — never! The simple fact is that—there being no smith in Israel (1 Sam. xiii. 19)—David very prudently employed these people in the manufacture of the instruments named. He set them or put them to the saw and to cutting instruments, and axes of iron, which undoubtedly he found very useful among his own people. They were, in fact, compelled to labour as smiths, miners, and brick-

* [Yes, let it be thoroughly discussed, in the spirit of Christian gentlemen, and the truth, on which side soever it may be, will come to the surface. We have received a very long manuscript from Mr. Hayward, who believes that the soul lives after the death of the body. His paper will make two, or more probably three, articles, the first of which will appear soon.—Ed.]

Digitized by Google

makers to the victorious king, and were neither slain nor tortured. Yours respectfully,

AUSTIN MARCH.

"UNCHRISTIAN" PSALMS.

DEAR SIR,—In the RAINBOW for November (pp. 498-9) a contributor makes reference to that greatest of stumbling blocks to some minds—the curses and imprecations contained in Psalm cix. With your permission, I would suggest to your readers a simpler, and, as it seems to me, more satisfactory way out of the difficulty attaching to the passage than that argued for by your correspondent. It is this—Understand the word "saying" at end of verse 5 (as in Psalm ii. 2, &c.), and read verses 6 to 19 as the utterance, not of David against his enemies, but of David's enemies against him, *quoted* by the psalmist in laying his plaint before God.

This solution seems both simple and thorough, and makes a harmonious agreement with the earlier and later portions of the same psalm. It is advocated by Jewish commentators and some distinguished Christian scholars; and will be found carefully and exhaustively discussed by Mr. Hammond in "The Expositor" for November 1875, to whose arguments in its support I take leave to refer any one to whom the reading suggested may be novel. Yours sincerely,

Glasgow. M. W. STRANG.

Literature.

Five Pillars from the Rock of Ages. By F. Hughes. London: Haughton and Co., 10, Paternoster Row.

THE title of this small book is quaint, but suggestive of "strong consolation." Indeed, that is its very object. The "five pillars" are—"I — Will — Give — You—Rest." On each of these words Mr. Hughes has a few paragraphs full of gratitude for the rich grace of God in Christ. We should not be surprised to hear that this little book, which has no literary pretensions, although well written, is used of God as the guide to "rest" to many weary ones. The writer utters a profound truth when he says, "God could not rest without man, and man cannot rest away from God." That is the entire Bible!

Hallowed Ground, and other Poems. By George Paulin, Rector of Irvine Academy, Ayrshire. Edinburgh: James Taylor, Castle Street; London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.

MR. PAULIN'S "friends" were not "partial" but wise when they asked him to collect and publish his poems. Some of them are old acquaintances whose familiar faces we love; others are strangers but of such graceful form that they secure esteem at once. Without metaphor, these poems are poetry. Mr. Paulin is a scholar, a Christian, and a loving believer in the coming of the Lord. His book deserves many readers.

The Biblical Museum. By James Comper Gray. London: Stock.

THE nature of this book has been described before in this Magazine. It is a collection of notes, from all possible sources, explanatory, homiletic, and illustrative, on the Holy Scriptures. It is meant to help ministers, students, and Sunday-school teachers, and it will help them, for Mr. Gray spares no labour to make his work a "Museum," as he calls it. This, the first Old Testament volume, contains notes on Genesis and Exodus.

Digitized by Google

It is a handsome book for the library, and may be frequently consulted with advantage.

Dickinson's Theological Quarterly, No. 9, vol. iii. January 1877. London: Dickinson, Farringdon Street.

THE range of subjects treated of in this Journal is wide and varied. When we say that in the first number for this year, amongst others, are articles on "The Denial of the Supernatural," "The Eleusinian Mysteries," "The Immortality of the Human Soul," and "The Future of Catholic Nations," our readers will see at once that this Quarterly extends its researches to a vast variety of subjects of the deepest interest to the theological student. Among the writers are names widely known, and the articles are, in general, marked by ability and acquaintance with the subjects of which they treat.

The Holy Childhood. Conversations on the Earliest Portion of the Gospel Narrative. London: Nisbet & Co.

THIS handsomely printed and nicely illustrated volume, from the pen of the author of "The Bond of Peace,"—a work which we noticed some months ago,—calls at our hands for an equal meed of commendation. It is published, we are informed in the preface, "in the hope that to some mothers, or other teachers, it may afford a little aid in imparting biblical instruction;" being "intended rather to be read to children, than to be read by them." We think the book will be found well suited to its purpose. The teaching is substantially Evangelical, but at the same time catholic—not Catholic—and it is written in an interesting manner. One thing which particularly pleases us in this author's writings is a refreshing absence of *cant*, in other words of the technical phraseology of the sects.

The Weapons of our Warfare. By William Landels, D.D.

Religious Life in the Rural Districts of England. By John Clifford, M.A. London: Yates and Alexander, 21, Castle St., Holborn.

THESE are addresses delivered at the Baptist Union, held at Birmingham, last October. We recognise the ability of both, and doubtless they will be valued by the body with which the speakers are more immediately connected; but for us their interest is very small compared with the immeasurably higher objects for which we labour.

NOTICES.

FRIENDS willing to distribute copies of the "Report on Conditional Immortality," are requested to apply to Mr. Stock, our publisher, and they will receive as many as they can use, without waste, free of cost.

"W. H. W," Melbourne.—We are obliged by your letter. The information it contains respecting the progress of the truth in Australia is very gratifying. We thank God and take courage.

"CURRENT THEOLOGY EXAMINED" is the title of "Twelve Lectures delivered in the Baptist Chapel, Beechworth, during the months of July, August, and September, 1876. By John Row, Pastor." It is an able and intelligent work.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

MARCH, 1877.

THE ROYAL PRIESTHOOD.

"Ye are a Royal Priesthood."—1 PET. ii. 9.

I HAVE been frequently struck, in reading history, with the great importance attached not only among all uncivilised, but still more so among civilised nations, to the Priests of the various tribes and kingdoms. No nation seems to have been altogether without them; the savage has his "medicine man," just as the heathen world had its so-called "priest;" and I believe there is hardly a single instance of a tribe being found without some man or body of men corresponding to such a caste.

Now the great feature or characteristic of a priesthood is, that it is supposed to be more *en rapport*, so to speak, with the Divine Being, or with some order of beings higher than ourselves, than is the case with the laity. It is on this account that priests are generally so much respected and looked up to; the idea being that they are able in some way or other to communicate with the higher powers, and thereby to procure earthly or spiritual blessings both for themselves and for others. It is also very remarkable that on great occasions we always find, in history, that the priest and the king *combine*.

Tacitus relates that when Agricola was sent, as governor, into Britain, he was invested also with the Pontifical office, and we know that the Roman emperors claimed to be in an especial manner the High Priests of Paganism. The Roman emperor appears in fact to have been *ex officio* the Pontifex Maximus, by whom alone certain rites could be adequately performed, and we find that to this day the Chinese look up to their emperor as being "Son of the sun," and consider their empire as *Celestial*.

It was therefore to the king or ruler that obedience and worship were held to be due in some especial sense, not only as under the protection of the gods, but even as partaking of their nature and power.

Digitized by Google

This applies in a still greater degree to the monarchies of the ancient world, such as those of Nineveh and Babylon. In all the ancient palaces and buildings, so marvellously brought to light during this century, we invariably find the monarch, as represented in the sculptures, to be especially under the presiding care of the deities of the nation.

It seems to me, therefore, quite a mistake to suppose that these ancient kings and tyrants were obeyed simply from fear,—there was something more than this in all the grand ceremonial and etiquette of Eastern courts. "The kings seem to have united the priestly with the regal character, and in the religious scenes representing their acts of worship, no priest ever intervenes between them and the god, or appears to assume any but a very subordinate position."* Mr. Rawlinson also says, speaking of the inscriptions made by Tiglath Pileser, "Perhaps the most striking feature of this inscription, when it is compared with other historical documents of the same kind, belonging to other ages and nations, is its intensely religious character, . . . the pervading idea that the wars were undertaken for the chastisement of the enemies of Asshur . . . and the striking final prayer; all these are so many proofs of the prominent place which religion held in the thoughts of the king, and may fairly be accepted as indications of the general tone and temper of his people. . . His wars are religious wars as much as wars of conquest." All which seems to prove that these ancient monarchs had a strong belief or persuasion that they were in an especial sense vicegerents of heaven and were not simply kings but priests also as regards their subjects.

The same thing prevailed also among the ancient Romans. "The king of the sacrifices represented the power of Numa and of his successors in the religious functions which could only be performed by royal hands."†

The universal prevalence of these ideas, the great importance attached to them, and the feeling of awe and reverence which seems to have accompanied them, are almost of themselves proofs that there is a great truth at the bottom of them, however much they may have been abused and corrupted.

They must correspond with some deep-rooted, ineradicable feelings of the human soul. They *cannot* be got rid of, because they answer to a profound need of man's spirit, and I am led to conclude, therefore, that there is a strong element of truth in them. That truth I believe to be this,—That the deliverance of the whole creation from its present bondage to corruption is to be effected by those whom God has in his infinite wisdom and love been training and preparing for the great work they are to accomplish under their great Captain and Saviour. These noble souls constitute "*the*

* Rawlinson's "Ancient Monarchies."
† Gibbon's "Roman Empire," chap. 28.

Digitized by Google

Elect" of Scripture, and it is through them, and through them alone, that deliverance can come.

Unfortunately for the world, and still more so for the Church, this idea has been entirely lost sight of, owing to the belief that God has chosen his elect for their own good exclusively, caring comparatively little (if at all according to some) for the rest of his creatures. This it is which has so often made the very elect "wise in their own conceits," and prevented them from performing many noble actions which otherwise they might have done. Some indeed there have been in all ages who were enabled to see that they were "called" not for themselves only, but that they might be made a blessing to others, but these have been comparatively few. The notion,—utterly mistaken as I think it is,—that God has his *favourites*, so to speak, has not only been terribly prejudicial to the human race, but it has indirectly, if not directly, been the cause of that spirit of Ecclesiasticism which has been so ruinous to the world. For if once the idea be entertained that God saves some and casts aside others altogether, both here and hereafter, the conception of the discipline and training so needful for the elect becomes altogether lost to sight.

The idea entertained by ancient nations of the king being almost a demi-god, took its rise doubtless originally from some reminiscence of the original promise to Adam, as to the deliverance of the human race by some great *man*. And even more than this, it is most probable that these very kings believed it themselves, and in many instances may have easily thought that their vast enterprises and conquests were to be the prelude of great good and happiness to the human race.

We may be quite certain that the promise of a Messiah, to appear at some unknown period, was the one that would longest retain its hold on men who were able to think at all, and I believe myself that it never died out entirely among nations that were at all civilised. With this hope was no doubt associated another, viz., that this Messiah would be attended and surrounded by other though inferior princes and heroes. Hence, it would appear, arose that feeling of hero-worship which we all more or less entertain; and it is remarkable, also, that our admiration is always given, in the greatest degree, to those who have suffered or fought against great odds, or exposed themselves to terrible dangers. In spite of ourselves we are compelled to admire such conduct even in an enemy, and to look up to such as having ennobled and sanctified our common nature.

Now Scripture teaches us that these feelings, when directed to the proper objects, are quite right. Not only is the Messiah to be a great King and Deliverer, but he is to have under him a great army of spiritual heroes, who are to help him in his work. In the Book of Revelation, when "the kings of the earth" are gathered

Digitized by Google

together to make war against Christ, we find our Lord coming forth to meet them, not alone, but attended by his saints, who form the great army of which he is the General; and this, I think, is a clear proof that the saints are to take a great part in that battle and are not to be mere passive spectators.

It has been very truly said that the history of the world is the history of a few great men. Do not we find throughout the ages that even in earthly affairs no good is effected except through the agency of those who are able to direct and govern aright the forces which zeal and enthusiasm supply? The principle of election is found everywhere throughout nature, and when used properly is always found to work well. A statesman of the present day has very justly observed, that while the educated and upper classes of a country ought to be the rulers of that country, they can only be so properly by putting themselves at the head of every noble and righteous movement regardless of themselves. Now this is exactly what the rulers of the new earth will do according to the view I have taken; they will be employed under the presiding care and direction of their divine Master in reconciling all things to God. They will be rulers worthy of the name of kings and of priests, and under their guidance the world will learn the blessedness of righteous government. In the past history of the world, here and there at long intervals, God has raised up kings who could and did show to the world what righteous government meant. Such a ruler, for instance, was the Roman Emperor, Antoninus Pius, who alone among the early emperors did not persecute the Christians, and who was regarded as a *father* by his subjects.

Under proper guidance and rule there really seems no limit to the progress humanity might make, for the feeblest and weakest have in them the germs of better things. My readers, I am sure, will pardon me if, while on this subject, I quote from a paper read, it seems, at a country village meeting by a plain working man: "By receiving them (i.e., the weak and ignorant), we may help them to more enlarged views and a stronger faith. God means that the strong should strengthen the weak; that the wise should teach the ignorant; that the holy should assist the impure. In so doing we are co-workers with God and are fulfilling his blessed will."*

"*Behold a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment.*" Inasmuch as this prophecy has never been fulfilled in its integrity in this world, and moreover does not seem at all likely to be fulfilled, we must reserve our hopes of its being so for the "new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Now if, as we are all agreed, Christ is the King alluded to,—who are the princes? Surely they are none other than the elect—the first-

* "Sunday Morning." Vol. i. p. 55.

Digitized by Google

fruits of the earth. None but these can share the *glory* of their Lord. "Hidden at present from mortal eye, they will one day be owned and made manifest before an assembled world as the best, the noblest, the most Christ-like souls earth, with all its discipline and heaven with all its love, can fashion and bring forth. Loving, truthful, and unselfish; broad in their sympathies, candid in their judgments, honourable in their lives, and humble in the estimate they form of themselves, these, the true sons and daughters of the Highest, will one day issue from the obscurity in which it pleases God as yet to hide them, and stand confessed God's own nobility, the aristocracy of the skies."* These constitute, in the glowing words of St. Peter, "the chosen generation—the *royal priesthood*, for whose manifestation the earth is now so anxiously longing. It is a remarkable fact that no human being can tell with certainty *who* and *where* they are now; for though we may see and know many individuals whom we may believe to form a portion of that body, yet as we cannot read the heart, we must more or less remain in doubt on the subject. In this as in everything else infallibility is excluded. It is not given to any of us to know with *certainty* who are and who are not among the true kings and priests of God's kingdom. That kingdom "cometh not with observation," and wisely and righteously has it been so ordained of God. The kingdom can never be properly constituted without the presence of its King, and that King having been rejected and disowned by this present world, it is vain for us to expect any visible sign of its existence until His return.

Herein, as I venture to think, consists the mistake of those who apply the promises of Scripture to this earth in its present state. It is the old mistake of the Jew over again, as it is also the mistake of all who now consider themselves priests. The *root-thought* of what is called High Churchism, Ecclesiasticism, or Ultramontanism is I think quite a true one, the mistake made in connection with it being as regards the *time*. God has, or rather will have hereafter, his kings and his priests, but they are not yet such. They are in this world only preparing for their exalted offices, and are being trained and disciplined in a most marvellous manner, in order that in the new earth they may be co-workers with God and with Christ, in reconciling all things in heaven and earth to him who made them.

All that which has the outward appearance of priesthood in this age; all that external dignity and honour possessed by the so-called priests of the Church of Rome, or the Church of England, or any other church, is unreal and false. It is no more the real thing than tinsel is gold. It may be compared to the scaffolding surrounding a building in process of erection, and like such a scaffolding it hides from view what is going on inside. I do

* Dunn's "Destiny of the Human Race." Vol. i. p. 344.

Digitized by Google

not mean to say that *some* at all events of those who are externally priests now, may not also be hereafter real priests; for I think it probable that a not inconsiderable number may be so; but I do maintain that the one order of priesthood is of the earth, earthy, while the other alone is heavenly.

Had this not been so, we should have expected our Lord to have been of the tribe of Levi, instead of which he was of the tribe of Judah, "a tribe of which no mention is made concerning priesthood." In fact he was not properly speaking the great High Priest until he had offered up himself, and equally so is it with his people; they are not in the true sense of the word *priests* at all, until, like their Lord, they have passed through the gates of death. It is worthy of notice that under the law of Moses, a man could not perform the office of a priest until he was thirty years of age, and even so a time is set for the priests of "the new earth" before they have been sufficiently disciplined for that high office, which time appears to be their whole life in this world. Surely if Christ was to be made in all things like unto his brethren, we are justified in the belief that in all essential points the training and discipline of his elect must be somewhat similar in character, though of course not in degree; and if Christ was such a blessing to the human race why are not his brethren also to be like him in this important respect?

When God has cast off the Jews as a nation, we have no reason at all to believe that he ever authorised any other nation or nations, *as such*, to take their place. He calls a certain number of *individuals* out of every nation, tribe, and tongue, to take the place of the cast off branches; but he never calls *nations* as such in the place of the Jews. Nations and kingdoms rise and fall, and though each and all seem to have an idea that *it* is the especially favoured one, yet no satisfactory proof has ever been given that it is so. Individuals indeed of every nation, tribe, and tongue, will be grafted into the true olive tree, but it is as impossible to graft a *nation* on to this sacred stock, as it is to engraft one full grown trunk on to another tree. This process can only be done effectually with small and individual branches.

The great and peculiar feature in the royal glory of our Lord is that "He shall be *a priest upon his throne*." (Zech. vi. 13.) He will combine in his own person the two characters, and consequently his power will be universal and quite beyond the possibility of reversion. Had he only come into this world to be a *king*, his spotless life and his sublime teaching would seem to have fitted him completely for that office, but he came to be a *priest* also, and as such it was plainly necessary that he should have something to offer. *Before* his crucifixion he told his Father that he had "finished the work he had given him to do" (John xvii. 4); but there was yet to follow the great act of self-sacrifice and obedience unto death, which not only fitted him for the high priesthood, but

Digitized by Google

also was the means whereby the power of Death and Hades was shattered to pieces.

It is a very true remark, that no one is fitted to *rule* who has not first learned to *obey*, and our Lord himself was no exception to this rule. But when his obedience and loving trust in his Father was thus perfected by his *voluntary* death,—for it should be observed that according to his own words no one could take his life from him, but he laid it down of himself,—he became at once the great ruler and High Priest of the fallen human race. He alone, indeed, can enter into the Most Holy place, but he has been pleased to associate with himself in the great work of bringing the world into subjection, brethren chosen out of every kindred and nation, to whom he gives even in this world the high and marvellous privilege of being called the sons and daughters of the Most High, and is therefore "not ashamed to call them brethren." If then this be so, is it not most probable that as they are to sit down with him in his throne, they will also be priests of a very high order and dignity. They are to be, so to speak, the pillars and supports of the great temple of which Christ is the chief corner stone. This temple is not yet built, but stone after stone is being cut out and prepared in this world, so that "no sound of axe or hammer" may be heard while they are being placed in position.

The true type of the Lord Jesus in "the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," is undoubtedly not *David* but *Melchizedek*. David typifies a lower title and kingdom, albeit an exalted one; but Melchizedek typifies a much higher, indeed the very highest form of authority and power.

David, we are told, though extremely desirous to build the temple, was not permitted to do so. He was permitted only to make preparation for it. He had waged many wars, had shed much blood, and it was reserved for his son Solomon,—whose name being interpreted is Peace,—to raise that glorious structure. Those, therefore, who imagine that *on this earth*, in its present state, the temple is already established, or the reign of heaven commenced, though doubtless they are, like David, often actuated by good and upright motives, have, it appears to me, no authority whatever, from Scripture, for such a view. All earthly power partakes too much of the character of David's government in this respect, viz., that it *must* more or less shed blood and be guilty in greater or less degrees of injustice. We must therefore *wait* until the antitype of Solomon himself appears upon the scene; then, and not till then, will the fair proportions of that temple "which is not for men but for the Lord God" appear.

Meanwhile, all we can do in this state of sin and sorrow, is to imitate David in *preparing* the stones, the timber, the wood, and the gold and silver which shall hereafter be made use of in the true building. Like David we may once have thought the true temple could be built in this present evil world, but we are certain, sooner

Digitized by Google

or later, to find out that it is not to be done. This present state is simply *preparatory, transitory,* and *unsatisfying,* but it is not therefore without a great end and object.

> "This earth is but for learning and for training;
> Earth's highest work but such as children do;
> The workmen here their priceless skill are learning,
> The true life's work is yonder,—out of view."
>
> * T. W.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE RATIONALE OF THE DOCTRINE.

PART I.

Current Theories and their Difficulties.

"I LOOK for the resurrection of the dead." This clause of the *Nicene Creed* would probably be at once accepted as expressing a fundamental truth of the Christian religion by all who in godly sincerity "name the name of Christ;" for that our Lord and his Apostles do, in the New Testament, teach *a* doctrine of the resurrection, is clearly beyond question. And not only so, but the fact that this doctrine occupied in their teaching a position and prominence which contrasts strangely with the comparative obscurity to which it is relegated in modern theology is equally uncontrovertible. Nevertheless, as soon as we proceed to inquire what the doctrine, as taught in the New Testament, really and definitively is, and in what sense we are now called upon to believe and apprehend it, very serious differences of opinion at once present themselves. Without pausing to trace minutely the critical history of the doctrine, which would require at least a separate article, we may say that at the present time *four* distinct, and to a large extent hostile, theories of the resurrection are more or less extensively accepted. These theories may be distinguished as:—(1) The LITERAL-IDENTITY theory: (2) The GERM-SURVIVAL theory: (3) The RE-INCARNATION theory: and (4) The SPIRITUAL BODY theory. Now, had we simply to decide for ourselves which of these four theories was the true and Scriptural one, the task would be one of some difficulty and responsibility, but this difficulty and responsibility are very seriously increased by the fact that each one of these theories appears to us, *per se,* exposed to most obvious and even insuperable objections. To make our meaning plain, however, it will be necessary to enter a little into detail, and briefly to consider these theories in their order.

I. *The Literal-Identity Theory,* is thus stated in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*: "At the last day such as are found alive

Digitized by Google

shall not die, but be changed: and all the dead shall be raised up, *with the self-same bodies and none other*, although with different qualities; which shall be united to their souls for ever" (chap. xxxii. § 2). That this was in all probability the earliest as well as the most generally received pre-scientific form of the doctrine admits of little doubt, as it is unquestionably the idea suggested by what has truly been called "the servile interpretation" of Scripture language. What the private opinions of the writers of the New Testament may have been we do not know, but even in their case we are surely at liberty to suppose that they, like the prophets before them, may only imperfectly have apprehended "what the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when it testified" on this great subject as well as on others. But whatever may have been the conceptions of the Apostles, we know at least that the majority of the so-called "Fathers" held this *literal-identity* theory very strongly. Justin Martyr maintained it with such grotesque servility that even cripples, he tells us, will rise with the same deformed or defective bodies which they possessed on earth, to be perfectly restored by Christ after the resurrection, at his second coming.* Titian again—the disciple of Justin Martyr—says, "Though my flesh be destroyed by fire, the world receives the vapourised matter (ἐξατμισθεῖσαν τὴν ὕλην), and though I be drowned in rivers and in seas, or torn in pieces by beasts, I am laid up in the treasury of a rich Lord." (*Ad Græcos*, sec. 6.) In like manner Tertullian, in his famous treatise, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, meets the rather obvious objection that certain members of our bodies will be useless in the future life, by saying, that the members of the human body are not only designed for the service of this visible world, but also for something higher; as even on earth the mouth serves not only for the purpose of eating, but also to speak and praise God. And he incidentally leads us to infer that the dentist's calling must have been in his day a very useless one, for he observes, "The teeth are providentially made eternal, to serve as the seeds of the resurrection." The great Jerome, again, *leaned* to the notion that all the "resurrected"—to use a convenient Americanism—will have the stature of a full-grown man, and, as a general rule, be thirty years old, that being our Lord's age when he entered upon his public ministry. "Every man's body," he tells us, "will be complete in quantity and in quality. As many hairs as have been shaved off, or nails cut, shall not return in such enormous quantities to deform their original places, but neither shall they perish; they shall return into the body, into that substance from which they grew." But to

* And in truth if we insist on understanding Scripture in the most literal sense possible, will not the language of Mark ix. 43-47, go far to support Justin's conclusion? "It is better for thee to *enter into life maimed*, than having two hands to go into hell." "It is better for thee to *enter into the kingdom of God with one eye*, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire."

Digitized by Google

what part of the body they shall thus return, or how a most portentous expansion of the body, at all events, is to be prevented, by the addition of so great a mass of matter,—an amount as we now know vastly greater than Tertullian could have supposed,—he nowhere informs us.

In the same strictly defined literal sense, the doctrine of the resurrection of the same body which is laid in the grave was a prominent theme in the theology of the middle ages. "The great body of the Scholastics," says Alger, "stood staunchly by it. In defence and support of the church-thesis they brought all the quirks and quiddities of their subtle dialectics. As we take down their ponderous tomes from their neglected shelves, and turn over the dusty, faded old leaves, we find chapter after chapter in many a formidable old folio occupied with grave discussions, carried on in acute logical terminology, of questions like these: 'Will the resurrection be natural or miraculous?' 'Will each one's hairs and nails all be restored to him in the resurrection?' 'When bodies are raised, will each soul spontaneously know its own and enter it? or, will the power of God distribute them as they belong?' 'Will the deformities and scars of our present bodies be retained in the resurrection?' 'Will all rise of the same age?' 'Will all have one size and sex?' And so on with hundreds of kindred questions."* Thomas Aquinas himself—"the angelical doctor," to whom it was reported that an image of the Redeemer had spoken words praising his writings,—maintaining "that no other substance would rise from the grave except that which belonged to the individual *at the moment of death*." A proposition which must indeed conjure up before many minds a prospect truly horrible.

Shorn of some of its patristic and mediæval extravagancies, but gaining little either in logical force or scientific credibility, the doctrine in this form has come down even to our own day, being still sometimes stated in the most grotesque and uncompromising manner. Practically, however, this theory of the resurrection may now be regarded as having been given up by educated and thoughtful minds, and probably no theologian, of any school, careful of his own reputation as such, would care to undertake its defence.

Even in the earlier ages of Christianity the enormous difficulties by which it was beset were clearly recognised. Athenagoras mentions, as a common objection of the heathen, the practice of cannibalism, whereby the body of one man became a part of the substance of others, which he endeavours to meet by the manifestly false assumption that human flesh eaten by man is not assimilated in the same manner as other food. Surely then, when such miserable shifts had to be resorted to, we need not wonder to find the great Augustine, in the fifth century, acknowledging that this doctrine of the resurrection of the body was the greatest stumbling-

* "Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life," p. 493.

Digitized by Google

block to the conversion of the heathen. But these antecedent difficulties become absolutely insuperable in the light of modern science. The established facts of organic chemistry—we speak here of no mere "scientific theories"—such as the small number of the elementary substances which enter into the composition of the animal body; carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen—the *organogens* as they are called—together with varying but comparatively small additions of some few solid elements, making up all we know of organic matter; while our fuller and more accurate knowledge of what we may call the chemistry of the grave, has dissipated any lingering faith in this theory of the resurrection as completely as the constituent substances of the organism committed to the earth, the ocean, or the fire, are themselves for ever dissipated.

It needs but little scientific knowledge to assure us what becomes of our body of flesh and blood after death. It does not—it cannot—arise from that "last sleep" in renewed vigour and beauty; it goes on to perish. Much the larger part of it escapes in a gaseous form into the atmosphere, so that in the end we may truly be said to be buried in the air rather than in the earth; and the residue sooner or later mixes itself indistinguishably with the soil; so that if a long disused cemetery were examined, say after the lapse of a century, nothing more, in all probability, would be found than a few fragments of bone of the hundreds of bodies it formerly contained. Let the ploughshare pass over it, let the grass grow and sheep feed on it, and these sheep themselves be eaten, and let this process continue for some generations, and the absurdity of attaching a rigidly literal interpretation even to the words of Christ, "All that are *in the graves* shall hear his voice, and shall come forth," will on these suppositions be manifest to the most simple mind. "Although, therefore, at first sight, to die may seem like falling asleep, the resemblance of death to sleep very quickly disappears. If we have at first thought of the living person as continuing to exist after death in a dormant state, the subsequent history of the body may naturally lead us to say that appearances deceived us, that instead of sleeping he has perished; decay has made him its victim."* In a word, if our only hope of resurrection rested on the supposition that the identical body which is committed to the grave is hereafter to come forth from that grave, then our hope would indeed be frail; for this both reason and experience assure us can never be; for, as the same distinguished writer from whom we have just quoted, goes on to observe, "The truth appears to be that the living person sheds off the body in which he goes through the change called death as completely and finally as he has shed off parts and particles of his body throughout his life."

Of course "miracle" may be invoked; but miracle, though a convenient refuge for a halting theology, is seldom a secure one.

* Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies.

Digitized by Google

The very invocation is a confession of weakness. We do not presume to set a limit to the infinite power of God; we do not deny a miraculous element in the resurrection; but let it be considered that in the case supposed not a single miracle, but a whole series of miracles of the most stupendous character and extended throughout many ages, must be assumed. We must, in the first place, suppose a standing miracle to preserve the countless atoms which make up a human body in their distinctness; by another miracle all these atoms must be brought back to the particular spot of earth in which the body they composed was originally deposited; by a third miracle these atoms must be again built up into that self-same body; and lastly, by a fourth miracle, the body thus reconstructed must be reunited to the soul and spirit of which it formed of old the earthly tabernacle. And all this must be done not once, but millions and millions of times! Truly, we should here have an exhibition of the miraculous in comparison with which all others would be insignificant: and—mark!—all for the attainment of an end which might, as even we can see, have been as completely and much more conspicuously attained by an infinitely smaller exercise of the Divine power. For what more is necessary than to suppose that by some infused quality—which need not be of a miraculous character—the human body, at the moment of death, became a substance of adamantine hardness, such as no hammer could crush, no acid dissolve, no heat consume? In that case not only would each body have been preserved from combination with every other, and have retained its own proper form and mass, but would at the same time have been a constant and striking prophecy of its own future reanimation; even as were the "bodies of the saints" mentioned in Matthew xxvii. 52. But this is not all. Even miracle is not lawless, though it may transcend the region of those laws with the operation of which we are alone familiar. Admitting fully the greatness of the Divine power, it has yet some obvious limitations. As God cannot do that which is inconsistent with his own nature and character, so neither can he do *that which is self-contradictory.* "But this, it may easily be shown, would be self-contradictory; for, not to speak of the difficulty of determining *which* of all the bodies in which the spirit of any living man has been clothed during his life is to be raised again—that which he had in youth, for instance, or in middle life, or in old age, each of which was as to its material constituents, entirely distinct from the others—not to dwell upon this, which is, nevertheless, a great and serious difficulty—it is enough to note this one fact, that very many of these atoms will have belonged not to one man only, but to many. They cannot possibly be restored to all of these."* We cannot, therefore, evade the difficulties attaching to this theory of the

* Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton, "Scripture Revelations of the Life of Man after Death," p. 27.

Digitized by Google

resurrection by an appeal to miracle, for to do so would be to "put ourselves to permanent intellectual confusion."

But there is still more to be said. Doubtless to the majority of the readers of the RAINBOW, the very first inquiry will be, What saith the Scriptures? Do they teach this doctrine, or anything like it? And happily for their peace of mind this question can without hesitation and without equivocation be answered in the negative. Not only is the patristic formula, *ανάστασις τῆς σαρκός* (resurrection of the flesh),—soon substituted for the *ανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν* (resurrection of the dead),—never found in the New Testament; but we have Paul's distinct assertion,—in the one New Testament passage in which anything approaching a rationale of the resurrection is to be found,—that the body which is sown in corruption is "*not* that body that shall be," forasmuch as "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;* neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." (1 Cor. xv. 37, 50.) While in another passage, in his second epistle to the Corinthians, the same apostle speaks of "the earthly house wherein we dwell being dissolved," or "destroyed" (*καταλύω*, 2 Cor. v. 1); not to be rebuilt out of the same materials, any more than in the same fashion, but to be superseded by "a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Hence there is in this case not even an apparent contradiction between Scripture and science, the statements of the one being, so far at least, in perfect harmony with the conclusions of the other. The literal-identity theory of the resurrection must, therefore, be set aside as absolutely untenable.

II. *The Germ-survival Theory.*—In theology, as in politics, there are always to be found two great parties, the stationary and the progressive; these who can rest contentedly in stereotyped or traditional conceptions of Divine truth, or at least are afraid to disturb them; and those who are ever striving to keep their theological conceptions abreast of the increasing knowledge, maturer reason, and ethical advance of their times. In reference to the particular subject before us, the latter party soon found themselves compelled to abandon the crude earlier form of the doctrine of the resurrection, to which reference has been made, and neither unnaturally nor unreasonably adopted what was in reality a refinement of the old rather than the substitution of a new theory. If it was impossible to contend for the preservation or restoration

* The distinction which has sometimes been drawn between the "flesh *and blood*" of which Paul here speaks, and the "flesh *and bones*" with which our Lord appeared to Thomas and the rest of the Apostles, we are constrained to regard as a mere theological quiddity. Science can recognise no such distinction, and Scripture expressly asserts that the blood is the life of the flesh. (Gen. ix. 4.) The reason why our Lord spoke only of his "flesh and bones" was doubtless because his object was to give tangible proof of his bodily presence. He could not well say, "Handle my blood."

Digitized by Google

of the whole matter of the body given over to the corruption of death, still might not at least a part—perhaps a very minute part—thereof be preserved, and so serve as the nucleus or germ of the resurrection body; thus securing the all important principle of physical identity? Paul's beautiful illustration of the seed, in 1 Cor. xv. 35-38, seemed to furnish an excellent *point d'appui* for this idea, and thus was built up the second of those theories of the resurrection which it is necessary for us to consider if only to reject.

Traces of this germ-survival theory are found at a very early period both in Jewish and Christian literature. "The Jews had a favourite tradition, developed by their Rabbis in many passages, that there was one small, almond-shaped bone (supposed now to have been the bone called by anatomists the *os coccygis*), which was indestructible, and would form the nucleus around which the rest of the body would gather at the time of the resurrection. This bone, named *Luz*, was miraculously preserved from demolition or decay. Pound it furiously on anvils, with heavy hammers of steel, burn it for ages in the fiercest furnaces, soak it for centuries in the strongest solvents,—all in vain: its magic structure still remains. So the Talmud tells."* The Jews did not, however, suppose this bone to be properly speaking the *germ* of the resurrection body, which after long burial would germinate as by a natural process; they regarded it simply as a nucleus around which the Messiah would, by a miracle, compel the decomposed flesh to return in pristine life; if indeed, as in many other of the apparent absurdities of the Talmud, we are not to seek a mystical meaning beneath the literal sense.

The Germ theory, more properly so called, was maintained by some of the Fathers, mainly on the authority of Paul's illustration. The writer of the article on the "Resurrection of the Body," in Blunt's "*Dictionary of Theology*," says,—"Another view of the resurrection was held by some of the Fathers, chiefly founded on the teaching of St. Paul. Tertullian maintained against Gnostic and other heretics the resurrection of the body or the flesh. In his treatise against Marcion, he fully admits the obvious inferences from St. Paul's teaching: thus he says, 'We do not claim the kingdom of God for the flesh but for the substance thereof, it will be no longer (the former) flesh and blood, but a body which God has given it.' St. Gregory Nyssen maintains, according to St. Paul's teaching, that the resurrection-body will not be a re-collection of dissolved elements (συνδρομὴ στοιχείων), and that such an opinion is represented by the Apostle as foolish, 'thou fool' (1 Cor. xv. 35); he says that the resurrection-body is not the same as the mortal body, nor yet wholly different from it; that one, in St. Paul's words, is the seed, and the other, the plant that springs from it in new form and beauty. (*De Anima et Resurrectione.*)

* Alger, *ubi supra.*

Digitized by Google

St. Basil terms the resurrection of the body a 'creation,' comparing the body in corruption to the chrysalis, and the glorified body to the beautiful insect springing from it. (*Hexæmeron*, lib. viii. § 8.) The teaching of Origen on the subject is uncertain: sometimes he wholly denies the resurrection, and yet in other passages maintains the doctrine of St. Paul, that as the plant from the seed, so the same body will rise in glory and immortality."

Among modern writers no one perhaps has advocated this theory of the resurrection in a more crude and grotesque form than the celebrated Dr. Isaac Watts, who, in the eighth of his "Philosophical Essays" thus expresses himself: It is very probable that a newborn infant, in its muscles and nerves, and especially in its bowels and bones (here we have the old Rabbinical *Luz* again), has some original essential, and constituent tubes, fibres, or staminal particles (if I may so call them), which remain the same and unchanged through all the stages and changes of life in following years, how much soever the external and fleshy parts may be changed. And some philosophers maintain that the growth of the animal body is nothing but the dilatation, stretching, and spreading of these essential and staminal parts, these fibres, tubes, and membranes, by the interposition of new additional particles, which additional and accidental particles are the only things which are in perpetual flux and always changing. And it may be added also, that perhaps these essential and indestructible particles are of such a nature as not to join and unite with other animal and human bodies (this was the assumption of Athenagoras, *see ante*) and become an essential constituent part of them; and, therefore, if mankind were all cannibals, and ate one another, as well as the flesh of beasts, yet the same staminal or constituent particles cannot belong to the bodies of two or more human beings."

Of course it is only fair to admit that this germ-survival theory of the resurrection has been and still is presented in a very much more subtle pseudo-scientific form than this; by no writer, perhaps, being more skilfully elaborated than by Samuel Drew, in his very remarkable and now rare book,—"*An Essay on the Identity and General Resurrection of the Human Body.*" By this acute advocate the theory is thus stated: "By the word *germ* or *stamen*, I understand a certain principle of future being which was lodged in the human body at its primary formation; which has 'grown with its growth' through all the intermediate changes of life; which constitutes perpetual sameness, and which shall form the rudiments of our future bodies. That it shall remain for ever as a radical and immovable principle; and shall either collect matter around it, which collected matter shall adhere for ever, or contains within itself all those particles which are necessary to constitute those bodies which we shall perpetually possess."*

* Page 239. Edition 1809.

Digitized by Google

Stated thus in its best form, this theory of the resurrection undoubtedly possesses much plausibility, and seems at first sight to remove many difficulties. The fact is, however, that they are not really removed, but only veiled. We have but to examine the theory carefully to discover that, as we have already said, it is in truth only a refinement of the literal-identity theory, and that most of the philosophical, scientific, and even scriptural objections which lie against that theory, as really, though less obviously, apply to this; while, on the other hand, it introduces some new and formidable difficulties peculiar to itself.

(1.) In the first place, it is confessedly only an *hypothetical explanation* constructed solely for the purpose of meeting the insuperable difficulties felt to attach to the former theory. It is a pure assumption that any such germ actually exists; and in all probability no one would ever have dreamed of its existence, had it not appeared essential to devise some rationale of the supposed truth of the resurrection of the same body. Certainly all the evidence within the reach of our senses goes strongly to negative the idea of its existence. No anatomist can indicate its probable locality within the human frame; to no microscopist, even by the aid of his most powerful instruments, has its form ever been revealed, though those same instruments enable him readily to discern the primordial germ from which the human organism is developed. To the question, *Where* is this germ to be found? modern eschatologists —less rash than Tertullian and the Rabbis—find themselves unable to return any answer save this,—"We cannot even guess." Nor can the same humiliating confession be avoided when we proceed to inquire, *What* is its nature? If this supposititious germ be *material*, as even Drew admits it to be; and indeed unless it were so it could hardly be the germ of a material body; then it must be supposed either to be subject to the natural laws which govern matter, which imply instability of form as much as indestructibility of substance, or it must be regarded as miraculously exempted from their operation. In the former case, inasmuch as this germ is not maintained to be a primary unit, the notion of its indestructibility must be abandoned, while in the latter case, miracle being invoked, the conception of the existence of any such germ would seem to be unnecessary. Moreover, if one body—that which we in this life possess—has been developed from such a germ; and another—the resurrection body—is yet to be; what is there to prevent the further supposition that—as in the Platonic conception of the pre-existing and immortal soul—many bodies may have previously sprung from it in the past, and others continue to do so, in an indefinite series, in the eternal future. In a word is not the fair and logical inference from this theory metempsychosis rather than a single resurrection?

(2.) But again, the fundamental conception of *identity* which underlies this theory of the resurrection appears to us to be philo-

Digitized by Google

sophically unsound and defective. Even if it could be demonstrated,—which no educated person will venture to assert,—that a comparatively small number of the material particles contained in our present mortal body would also have their place in the immortalised resurrection body,—this would not constitute the two bodies one and the same. No definition of *physical* identity—as e.g., the identity of a human body—is true and complete, which does not include a double sameness,—*sameness of substance* and *sameness of structure*. Supposing that we have the right and the will to pull down a certain building of stone—say a church—and to erect another, precisely the same in size and architecture, almost entirely of marble; would the fact that we used some small portion of the stone of the first church in the construction of the second be sufficient to make the two churches actually one and the same? Certainly not; because though the second church would possess identity of structure it would yet lack identity of substance. A marble church, though it contain some portion of stone, cannot be identical with a stone church though it contained some portion of marble. And so, on the other hand, if we pulled down a church of the Gothic style of architecture, and *of the very same materials*—assuming this to be possible—built another of the Italian style of architecture; would the fact that we had used the materials of the former church exclusively in the construction of the latter, be sufficient to constitute a perfect identity between them? Certainly not; because though the second church would thus possess sameness of substance it would altogether lack sameness of structure. An Italian church cannot be identical with a Gothic church though both be built with the same stone and wood and iron.

Now in both these respects the germ-survival theory of the resurrection fails to establish a true bodily identity, for which purpose alone it is maintained. For, on the one hand, inasmuch as only a very small number of the particles of the original body would thus be preserved, the resurrection body would after all lack sameness of substance; and on the other hand, since the Scriptures distinctly teach that the spiritual body must differ essentially from the natural body in organisation,—for Paul emphatically warns us that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"—it follows that it cannot possess sameness of structure. In truth it seems little to be considered by writers and teachers on this subject, *how much* is involved in this Apostolic declaration that "flesh and blood" cannot compose the human body in resurrection. In a body without blood the whole of the circulatory, digestive, and respiratory organs would be useless. Without blood the heart could not beat, the lungs play, the brain work, or the body be nourished; in a word, without blood no *flesh*—whether of men, or beasts, or fishes, or birds—can exist; hence the resurrection body must be an entirely new organisation; an organisation confessedly composed almost wholly of new material particles, and therefore it can

Digitized by Google

possess—despite the survival of the supposititious germ—neither substantial nor structural identity.

(3.) The *scientific objections* to this theory of the resurrection go, however, much deeper than this, and the only loophole which we have, at least consciously, left in the preceding argument on the question of identity,—the assumption, namely, that the germ contains potentially or in embryo the entire organism, which in its most mature form is only the expansion thereof,—is effectually stopped by the physiological facts to which we now proceed to call attention. All biologists are now agreed as to the fact that the human, like all other animal, and even vegetable, organisms, is the development of a single structureless cell, extremely minute in size,* and consisting chemically of an albuminous combination of carbon ;† which cell is in the case of man absolutely indistinguishable from the primordial cell of any other animal organism. "The earliest rudiment of every (human) ovum consists of a simple cell with soft granular protoplasm unenclosed by a membrane, a nucleus and a nucleolus. . . . When we first discern the primordial cell which is to evolve itself into the animal organism, we can trace nothing that essentially distinguishes it from that which might give origin to *any* other form of organic structure ; its condition in fact being alike in all, and permanently represented by the humblest single-cell plants and animals." So writes that distinguished English Physiologist, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, in his great text-book already referred to.‡ And so, to precisely the same effect, Haeckel, "the German Darwin" as he has been called, says, "Man is at the beginning of his individual existence a simple egg, a single little cell, just the same as every animal organism similarly originated. The human egg is essentially the same as that of all other mammals, and cannot be distinguished from the egg of the higher mammals. Not only the form and structure, but even the size of the egg in most mammals is the same as in man, namely, about the 120th part of an inch in diameter, so that the egg under favourable circumstances, with the naked eye, can just be perceived as a small speck."§

It follows, then, that the resurrection germ, if it exists, must be found within this minute speck of "albuminous combination of carbon," not more than the 1-120th of an inch in diameter, and

---

* "When mature the human ovum is extremely minute; not measuring above 1-120th of an inch in diameter, and being sometimes no more than half that size."—Dr. W. B. Carpenter. "Principles of Human Physiology," 8th edition, p. 957.

† "Organisms always contain albuminous combinations of carbon (protoplasm) in a semi-fluid condition of aggregation, which are always wanting in the Anorgana (unorganised substances).—Prof. Haeckel, "History of Creation," by Lankester, vol. i., p. 5.

‡ "Principles of Human Physiology." pp. 956, 992.

§ "History of Creation," vol. i., p. 297.

Digitized by Google

differing in no respect, so far as form, size, and chemical composition is concerned, from the alike unorganised primordial cell of any other animal. Thus any and all of the supposed analogies supplied by the transformation of insects and the germination of the seeds of plants are at once swept away. The insects, in every stage of their development; and the seed, however minute, are themselves complex organisms, and we have, in reference to the subject before us, to do not with them but with the single simple protoplasmic cells from which they were alike developed by a process which is, at least in its initial stages, identical.

Moreover, this process of development,—to say nothing of the chemical composition of the primordial cell,—which is now so fully understood, renders any idea of the persistence and indestructibility of the human egg-cell or any part thereof quite untenable. The primordial cell is not a stable nucleus, around which or out of which the organism is developed as the plant is from the seed, but rather like one brick in a wall—supposing only that it had the power of breaking up into other bricks, which power those other bricks should in turn possess—which differs in no respect and is ultimately of no more importance than any other brick in the wall, and in point of fact ceases very speedily to have any distinct existence within the organism. To refer to the high authorities we have already quoted, "The process of development of the cell in the case of man," says Haeckel, "is precisely the same as in the other mammals, commencing by *the division of this simple egg-cell by the process of cell-division.*" And so, Dr. Carpenter: "The earliest stage of its development consists in simple multiplication *by 'duplicative subdivision' of its contents*, so that a mass of cell-like bodies comes to be produced, *amidst the several components of which no difference can be traced;* and this also finds its parallel among the simpler organisms of both kingdoms." . . . "A marked divergence occurs, however, at a very early period, according to whether the whole contents of the ovum undergo segmentation, and are directly converted into the growing embryo, or whether only a portion is thus segmented, the remainder forming a bag over which vessels are developed effecting the absorption of its contents, and thus enabling it indirectly to participate in the process of development." The former being the case with man.

To those who have correctly apprehended these physiological facts, and their important bearing on the theory we are considering, it will be quite obvious that the supposition of any surviving germ is scientifically incredible. We have already endeavoured to show that even could the existence of such a germ be demonstrated, it would not be sufficient to establish a true physical identity; but in the light of these well-established physiological conclusions it becomes further manifest that any such identity would be—to use the apt and amusing illustration of the authors of "*The Unseen Universe*"—nothing better than that of the Irishman's coat com-

Digitized by Google

posed of rags which were continually being replaced as the old fell to pieces, while not a fragment of the original material remained.

(4.) Only one thing more need be added to make the invalidation of this theory of the resurrection complete. We pointed out in reference to the *literal-identity* theory that in addition to scientific and philosophical objections, it was not only unsanctioned by, but actually *opposed to, the teaching of Scripture.* Now this crowning objection can be urged with almost equal force against the *germ-survival* theory. No *locus standi* has ever been claimed for it in Scripture excepting Paul's reference to the mystery of vegetable growth in his great argument in 1 Cor. xv. 36-38. But the question is whether by that reference the apostle intended to indicate a strictly analagous process, or simply used the natural fact as an apposite illustration. If we suppose the former, we must, by a wholly gratuitous assumption, commit the inspired writer to a statement which is, as we have seen, contrary to all the ascertainable facts; and furthermore, involve him in self-contradiction on this very subject. Is it not a gratuitous assumption that Paul intended to indicate a really analogous process in the case of the germination of a seed and the resurrection of the human body, when not only is there not a single other passage to be found in Scripture where anything of the kind is hinted at, but when we find the same figure used by our Lord himself, in a connection which renders it quite impossible that anything more than an illustration was intended? We refer of course to that very striking and important word in John xii. 24, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth by itself alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Here it is quite obvious that no analogous process is suggested. The "much fruit" spoken of is the great harvest of the redeemed; but surely no sane interpreter will maintain that the Church is developed physically out of the buried body of the Redeemer. In no sense would this be true, for Christ's body did not undergo decomposition, to which the change in the seed must be supposed to correspond; and, moreover, we should in this case be compelled to assume the existence in Christ's buried body not of a single such "germ," but of an infinite number corresponding to that of the countless host of the redeemed.

The fact in the natural world to which, as we understand it, our Lord and the Apostle alike referred when they used this figure of vegetable growth, is simply this:—that in the progress from a lower to a higher degree or kind of life, death often—perhaps always—intervenes. Death is ever the gate to the higher life. There is the seed, it has life though that life is neither manifested nor developed, and in order that it may be manifested and developed it must be buried in the ground and undergo a process of dissolution. So it is with the Christian—of whom alone Paul is speaking—he has a natural body, a mortal life; but that natural, or animal body must perish, that mortal life must come to an end,

Digitized by Google

ere the spiritual body and the eternal life can be developed and manifested. "That which thou sowest is not quickened"—could not be quickened to its higher life—"except it die." This is God's order: "If there is a natural body there is also a spiritual. Howbeit the spiritual is not first, but the natural, and *afterward* the spiritual." 'Tis ever thus,

> "The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
> And God fulfils himself in many ways."

Ways which are still closer approximations to his own divine ideal; and so we too shall in resurrection be "changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

But again, we have said that to understand the apostle as indicating an analogous process between the phenomena of vegetable growth and the resurrection would be to involve him in self-contradiction; and it would do so, we think, in two respects. In the first place he most distinctly tells us that the body sown is "*not that body that shall be.*" (1 Cor. xv. 37.) How could it be so when, as he proceeds further to inform us, "It is sown in corruption; it riseth in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour; it riseth in glory; it is sown in weakness; it riseth in power; *it is sown a natural body; it riseth a spiritual body.*" (1 Cor. xv. 42-44.) Now we know on an authority higher even than that of Paul, that "that which is born of (ἐκ, 'out of') the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of (ἐκ, 'out of') the spirit is spirit." (John iii. 6.) Since then the body which is supposed to be sown is a natural or fleshly body, the germ which is assumed to be *in* and *of* that body could assuredly only produce another body of the like kind; in other words, a fleshly or animal germ could only produce a fleshly or animal body; even as the corn of wheat can only produce wheat, and the corn of barley barley; the seed never producing a plant of a different or higher species than that by which it was itself produced: which plainly would contradict Paul's assertion in the text just quoted that the resurrection body is not to be animal but spiritual. And so again, in another passage, second only in importance, in reference to this subject, to his great argument in 1 Cor. xv.—a passage we have already referred to and shall have to refer to again—Paul speaks of the resurrection body, not as arising from the natural body, by any natural law of continuity, but as belonging to a different sphere of existence, and springing from a different source. "For," he says, "we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house *which is from heaven.*" (2 Cor. v. 1, 2.) A statement which cannot possibly be harmonised with the supposition that in his reference to vegetable growth the apostle intended to indicate any analogous process in the development of the resurrection body; that is if by the "sowing" we understand the sowing of the mortal body

Digitized by Google

in the grave, and by the "quickening" the reanimation of the body thus sown.

On the fourfold ground, then, that this germ-survival theory is simply a theory invented to serve a purpose; that in point of fact it fails to answer the purpose it was invented to serve; that it is contradicted and rendered incredible by well-established scientific facts; and lastly, that it finds no sanction or support in the Scriptures themselves, we are compelled to reject this theory of the resurrection as decisively as we rejected that literal-identity theory, of which, as we have said, it is only a modification and refinement.

In our next paper we will consider the two other theories of the resurrection to which reference was made at the commencement of this article.

W. MAUDE.

Florence Villa, North Finchley.

(*To be continued.*)

THE DIVINE FATHERHOOD.

"The Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father."—ROM. viii. 15.

MY Father! O the holy joy,
The luxury of bliss,
That I can at thy feet employ
A name so dear as this!

My Father! when the griefs of time
Would fill me with despair,
I have the privilege sublime
To come to thee in prayer.

A feeble child, for help divine
I humbly look to thee;
O Father, let thy heart incline
Thy hand to succour me.

It will, my Father! for the years
That I have known thy heart
Rebuke all unbelieving fears,
And tell me what thou art.

The filial word I use in prayer,
Is by adoption mine;
Its use is more than I could dare,
Without a right divine.

Father in Christ! thy name I sing,
For thy great grace to me,
That by thy Spirit bade me bring
My heart in love to thee!

Digitized by Google

NARROW VIEWS AND BROAD VIEWS.

A GREAT want of the religious world in the present day is a correct knowledge of the terms of salvation as prescribed by the great Teacher himself. It is admitted on all hands (with the exception perhaps of the Universalist) that there are terms of salvation—that God has been pleased in his wisdom and goodness to save such members of the human family as comply with certain conditions. What these are is matter for fair inquiry. As very different views are entertained on the subject every contribution towards a Scriptural answer—whether broad or narrow so-called, should be welcomed by every one who is desirous to know the truth in the matter.

In such an inquiry it should be laid down as a first principle that while every one must judge for himself what are the terms which God has revealed, we are not the judges of whether certain terms are narrow or broad. It is the just dimension of God's rule that must determine the truth in such a question apart from the fallible judgment of man.

It is worthy of notice as a general factor in the outset of this inquiry that our Lord himself has authorised the application of the terms "narrow" and "broad" in this connection in a sense the farthest removed from the Universalist extreme—"Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be who go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

In the RAINBOW for August last, page 348, there is an article by T. W., entitled "Narrow Views" on the words of the apostle Peter uttered in the house of Cornelius—"Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." T. W. says, "Let us then be extremely careful how we interpret the seemingly narrow texts of the Bible, where such exist; for we shall find that every apparently narrow text has at least another quite as broad, which, taken as literally, would seem opposed to it." Suppose I take the liberty to reverse T. W.'s method in this way:—"Let us then be extremely careful how we interpret the seemingly broad texts of the Bible, where such exist: for we shall find that every apparently broad text has at least another quite as narrow, which, taken as literally, would seem opposed to it."

Without attempting to give any definition of the terms of salvation, I shall confine myself in what follows to a few remarks on the words founded on by T. W., for the purpose of showing their bearing on breadth or narrowness as to the terms of salvation.

There can hardly be a doubt that the admission of sinners, irrespective of nationality, to the blessings of salvation is the principal thing affirmed by Peter in the words quoted. And as this is

Digitized by Google

not questioned by any, the simple question is as to the terms upon which Jews and Gentiles alike may obtain salvation so far as these terms are affected by the words "he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him."

These words are only the introduction to an address occupying ten verses, and it is therefore necessary to ascertain their connection with what immediately follows. They were addressed by Peter to Cornelius and his kinsmen and friends, with six brethren of the circumcision who had accompanied Peter from Joppa to the house of Cornelius at Cæsarea.

It is worthy of especial notice that the idea that men are accepted merely on account of certain features of character is opposed to the main design of those peculiar circumstances under which the conversion of Cornelius took place. That design was the manifestation of God's purpose to "visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." This was described by them of the circumcision who had contended against Peter at Jerusalem, but who became convinced that it was of God—"Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Since, therefore, this was the first occasion on which God visited the Gentiles for this purpose, it follows that prior to this, their position in relation to God and salvation was that of being, in the language of Paul, to the Gentile disciples at Ephesus, "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise." Notwithstanding the excellent character ascribed to Cornelius there is no evidence that he was even a Jewish proselyte; and although there were, this would not have placed him in a better position than that of unbelieving Jews themselves.

But the words of the angel to Cornelius himself are sufficient to show us his true position at the time Peter used the words referred to. The angel had directed Cornelius to send men to Joppa and call for Peter, and added, "he shall tell thee WHAT THOU OUGHTEST TO DO." This statement of the angel is even more fully expressed by Peter in his rehearsal of the matter to those of the circumcision at Jerusalem, in which he gives the intimation of the angel in the following terms:—"Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words WHEREBY THOU AND ALL THY HOUSE SHALL BE SAVED."

It is here the question arises,—Why did Peter in telling Cornelius words whereby he should be saved, introduce those words by a statement which seems to imply that Cornelius was already saved, or accepted with God?

In answering this question it will be necessary to look somewhat closely into the connection in which the words stand. It may be remarked that the comparatively modern method of pointing, and division into verses, has materially contributed to render this passage unintelligible. There can be no doubt that the introductory sentences of verses 34 and 35 are much more closely

Digitized by Google

connected with those immediately following than is indicated by the pointing of the common version. The passage according to this version is as follows:—"Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all); that word I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power," &c. Nothing is more evident to me than this, that the words "accepted with him" should not be separated from those that follow by more than a comma. I am led to this conclusion by the fact that the translators in order to make what is really one sentence into two have been obliged to re-express in verse 36 the antecedent noun *God*, although there is no corresponding word in the original; but where the sense would be continued with perfect clearness by the use of the pronoun *he* understood in the third person singular of the verb *to send*.

There is another point requiring notice, which serves still farther to show the close connection between the two verses referred to. This is the circumstance that the Greek term *logos*, rendered "word" at the beginning of verse 36, is in the accusative case (*logon*). This accusative not being governed by any verb in the sentence, must necessarily be governed by a preposition understood. Indeed this is indicated by a direction of the Greek New Testament to supply the preposition *kata*, signifying "according to."

Before presenting the passage thus corrected, however, there is a point requiring notice in verse 37, in which the translators, by supplying the words "*I say*," which have no representative in the Greek, make it appear as if Peter repeated the word *logon* for the sake of clearness, and that consequently the first *logon*, as well as the second, is governed by the word "*know*;" thus dispensing with the understood preposition *kata*. Peter, however, does not use a second *logos*, but another term, and that evidently to express a different idea. The word employed is *rèma*, from a verb signifying "*to flow*," and, in a secondary sense, "*to speak*;" hence *rèma* is defined as signifying "*what has been said*," and might be appropriately rendered *a current report*. That it is employed in this sense in the passage in hand may be inferred from the fact that the word "published," which appears in connection with it in the common version, has no corresponding word in the Greek; showing that Peter was not, in this verse, directly referring to the apostolic proclamation of "the word of the Kingdom," but rather to that common report which had spread far and wide concerning it, and also concerning certain things relating to Jesus of Nazareth. This is borne out by Dr. Doddridge's translation, which is as follows: "Ye know the report there was through all Judea," &c.

Digitized by Google

The whole passage rendered with these emendations on the common version becomes at once intelligible, and in harmony not only with the narrative of which it forms part, but also with the general teaching of Scripture. It would then read thus: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him in conformity with the word which he sent unto the children of Israel preaching peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all). Ye know the report there was through all Judea, which began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit," &c.

It will be seen from this construction that Peter does not say that he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is on this account alone accepted with him; but that men of this character are accepted with God according to a certain word which He sent to the children of Israel by Jesus Christ. The terms of this preaching expressly required faith in the word conveyed in the message. There were fearers of God and workers of righteousness among the Jews to whom Jesus preached this word, but these were not on that account exempted from compliance with the terms imposed. True, the honest-hearted among Israel gladly received "the word of the Kingdom," because it spoke to them of the object of their national hope; but it was none the less imperative in its claims on their belief. This imperative character of the preaching of the Kingdom is seen in the manner in which our Lord spoke of his mission as a preacher. He said on one occasion—"I MUST preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also; FOR THEREFORE AM I SENT." He also said, "He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day." And again—"Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have everlasting life."

That this was the very "WORD" of which Peter says the common report "began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached," may be seen by a reference to the Gospel by Mark concerning "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." After describing the mission of John, Mark says, "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel." This shows the starting point of the preaching, and Matthew gives us an outline of the extent to which the report reached. He says: "Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of diseases among the people. And his fame went throughout all Syria. . . . . And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee and

Digitized by Google

from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan." We are also informed that at a later period of his ministry he visited the coasts of Tyre and Sidon on the west, and the towns of Cæsarea-Philippi on the north-east. Although Samaria was purposely avoided as a mission-field, and Cæsarea, where Cornelius lived, was a seaport near its northern boundary, yet being in the vicinity of Galilee the report of the preaching of Jesus and his apostles must have been well known in an important seaport town like Cæsarea.

Faith in the gospel, then, was required on the part of Israel—those "to whom pertained the adoption and the glory and the covenants, and the promises," in order to their acceptance with God, or in other words, to their being saved. If such was the case, is it in the least likely that the Gentiles who were aliens from all those privileges should be admitted to heirship of the Kingdom of God on terms less exclusive? By no means. The same conditions were required. The words of our Lord to his disciples are quite clear upon this point. "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name AMONG ALL NATIONS, beginning at Jerusalem." "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." And so it was; and the conversion of Cornelius was the initiation of this work. The conversion and apostleship of Saul of Tarsus put the matter into a practical shape. Paul's account of the object of his mission to the Gentiles is in these terms: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified THROUGH FAITH that is in me." What he preached is well described by Luke —"Paul dwelt two whole years (at Rome) in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ."

There is no evidence that this gospel rule was suspended in the case of Cornelius and his friends. It would appear that Peter viewed them in the light of the teaching of Jesus in the parable of the sower, as already hinted. "The word of the Kingdom" is likened to good seed sown in various kinds of soil, of which but one kind is represented as bringing forth fruit to perfection. "That on the good ground are they which, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience." Such a character was Cornelius. He was like good soil prepared for the good seed, come when it might. Whatever seeming success may follow the sowing of good seed on the hard beaten wayside, on stony ground, or among thorns, let it ever be remembered that, as a general rule, it is only in appearance. Certain qualities of native character in combination with the influence of the truth are

Digitized by Google

necessary to that "patient continuance in well-doing" which is indispensable in all who aspire to the "glory and honour and immortality," awaiting the "heirs of the kingdom which God hath prepared for them that love him."

Edinburgh. J. CAMERON.

THE NEW JERUSALEM.

(Read Rev. xxi. xxii.)

HAVING in former papers endeavoured to point out what the Bible reveals concerning the future home of the redeemed, the thought occurs that more reference should be made to the holy city the New Jerusalem, than the simple allusion contained in my closing sentence on p. 510 of the RAINBOW for November last. The matter however is somewhat formidable, not because I regard the description given of that glorious city difficult to comprehend,—for all the information given regarding it is contained in the last two chapters of the Apocalypse—but because of the manner in which the description there given has been explained by men of learning and influence. Besides, the view I take of it has been, and will be again, greeted with exclamations as:—"Ridiculous!" absurd!" "no man of common sense would ever entertain such an idea," &c.; so that it requires considerable courage to restate convictions, which are thought so unwise. In the RAINBOW, however, one is sure, in speaking of Scriptural matters, according to the literal-grammatical sense of the words of Scripture, that he is not alone; for whatever distinctness of character that periodical has gained for itself, it has done so by its adherence to the words of Scripture as expressive of its true meaning.

Yet many who go with us so far, in believing that the sense of Scripture is to be determined from the terms it uses, in the same way that other writings are treated, hesitate to abide by this rule when the New Jerusalem is the theme. To these, and all others, I would humbly, respectfully, and hopefully submit the following considerations. We do so the more confidently, that the view of the subject we are to present has already been given by a very able writer, in a volume of essays now out of print.* Not only the ideas, but also the words in which they are expressed in the following paragraphs are, for the most part, taken from the volume referred to.

It may be well to state at the outset, that I assume here that the scenes described in the last two chapters of the Apocalypse are post-millennial. The apostle says: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband," &c. (Rev. xxi. 1, 2.) The fact that the subject belongs to a period so distant, and to a state of things altogether new, and which, therefore,

---

* "Physico-Prophetical Essays," by the Rev. W. Lister, F.G.S., Vicar of Bushbury.

Digitized by Google

we are ill qualified fully to comprehend, should guard us against the influence of preconceived notions on the subject; and prevent us from objecting to the reality of the description, because of its extraordinary nature.

The description given of the New Jerusalem in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, is commonly understood to be a figurative representation of the splendour and magnificence of the Church in the eternal state. The idea of its being a literal city is entirely repudiated; and the details of the description of the city—its demensions, its river, and trees of life—are made of no account, but resolved into a general and indefinite symbol of the glorified Church. Some have, indeed, attempted to give a definite meaning to each separate symbol; but as it is impossible for them to prove the correctness of the interpretation, the result is only an exhibition of ingenuity, which may be imitated by scores of other men giving as many explanations, equally probable! The grand objection to this mode of viewing the description is its *uncertainty*. But it is asserted that the very idea of expecting a literal fulfilment of the prophecy is—"absurd" (see Albert Barnes, *in loc.*), and that we are therefore shut up to the figurative: but this is to assume the very question in debate, and to make ourselves judges of what is possible to Almighty God, and that in a state of things so different from the present. No theory can be more unwarrantable or unsound. The only legitimate course to pursue is first to ascertain in what light the rules of criticism require that the language should be understood; and then to abide by the result however extraordinary, however incredible it may appear.

The question before us is one of pure evidence: and the testimony of Scripture must decide it. Probability must not be allowed to interfere; for we are not in a position to judge of its probability. The wonderful, and hitherto unexampled character of the description is no good reason why we should think it untrue. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." That a virgin should conceive and bear a son is a very improbable event; yet no prediction was ever more literally fulfilled. Many of the scenes and events predicted in the Bible are of an unparalleled nature, some of these have already transpired, and answer exactly to the language employed in the prediction; the mere circumstance, then, that the description given of the New Jerusalem in the visions of John transcends anything witnessed on earth by us, or our forefathers, is no reason why we should not understand it as being really and literally the description of "a city whose builder and maker is God."

It is in the spirit of these observations I now direct attention to some of the most wonderful particulars of this heavenly city; those which present to us the most formidable difficulties.

1. THE DIMENSIONS of the city. They are stated thus:—"The city lieth four-square, and the length is as large as the breadth. And he measured the city with a reed, twelve thousand furlongs, the length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty-four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel." (Rev. xxi. 16, 17.)

Digitized by Google

The first thing that startles us is *the wondrous height* of the city. There is indeed an ambiguity in the terms used describing the measurement, which leaves a considerable degree of doubt on the mind as to whether the 12,000 furlongs should be understood of the length of only one side of the city, or of the four sides. There is a difference of opinion among commentators on this point: some taking the longer measurement, and some the shorter. As the terms used will agree with either idea, it seems impossible to arrive at certainty on the point.

According to the former measurement the city will be 1,500 miles in height; according to the latter 375 miles. Mr. Lister is inclined to believe that the longer measurement is intended to be understood; but, from the fact that 12,000 furlongs is given as the result of the measurement of the city, which is said to be foursquare, we think it probable that the shorter of these supposed measurements is the one intended; an altitude, however, which is still overwhelming to our conceptions.

From the difficulty of thus understanding the New Jerusalem to be a real city, some have sought refuge in a different reading in certain Greek manuscripts. Grenville Penn says that "The *Vatican* and *Moscow* MSS. read ver. 16, ἔιχε μέτρον κάλ. χρυσ.; and omit καὶ το τεῖχος—'*and the wall thereof*,' at the end of ver. 16 (Greek 15); they omit also τοσοῦτον ἐστίν, in ver. 17 (Greek 16). The Cod. 35 (*Magd. Oxon.* sec. xi.) omits το ὕψος—'*the height*' before ἴσα ἐστί—'*are equal*." The *Vat.* and *Mosc.* further omit ἐμετρήσε in ver. 18 (Greek 17). From combining these several variations of the text with its matter, we may critically conclude that it stood originally thus [when translated]:—"And he that spake to me had for a measure a golden reed (or rod) to measure the city, and its gates; and the city lieth four-square; and its length is the same as its breadth; and he measured the city with the reed 12,000 furlongs: its length and its breadth are equal. And the height of its wall is 144 cubits."

According to this the *height* of the city is not mentioned, and thus the grand difficulty in the way of the literal view is removed. When satisfied that this text is better established than the received one we shall readily adopt it, but we require other evidence than the simple fact of its existence, and the consideration that it helps us over a difficulty.

The eagerness with which a different reading, or translation is laid hold of when it favours one's particular idea, has often struck and surprised us. We are too apt to catch at a variation in the text, if it looks more favourably on a conclusion at which we have already arrived. This is neither wise nor safe; for the proposed "reading" *may be wrong*. It would be well if those who cite different readings and translations for the information of the unlearned, would give such reasons for the alteration as the mere English reader could appreciate, and thus enable him to judge of the matter for himself, instead of leaving him to accept the change merely upon trust. And it would be well if the student of the Scriptures, learned or unlearned, would always ask the question, when a different Greek text is presented to him—"What reason have I to believe this to be of higher authority or value than the other?" This question we now put regarding the "*combined* variations" of Grenville Penn. We wait for a reply; and in the meantime abide by the received text, although that it leaves the immense height of the

Digitized by Google

holy city to be accepted by those who believe in its reality. We feel the more warranted to do so by the fact that the received text, in the present instance, is adopted in that of S. P. Tregelles, LL.D., the value of which must be apparent to all, from the circumstance that there is not a single word retained in the Greek text of the Apocalypse which he compiled "*which is not guaranteed by manuscript authority of at least* TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS OLD; and by far the greater part is vouched for by MSS. of FOURTEEN HUNDRED YEARS OLD." "Indeed, including the evidence of *versions*, ALL has authority of at least this antiquity."

"But," some one exclaims, "the idea of a city 1,500 or even 375 miles high, is so manifestly absurd that it is quite useless to discuss it." Let such a one remember that almost all the realities of Scripture—historical as well as prophetical, have been pronounced "absurd." Doubtless the idea of such a city seems absurd, if judged by our present knowledge and experience; but the case is of such a nature, that it cannot be fairly judged of by the present standard, or by one which may seem reasonable according to our present knowledge; but must be estimated by the standard supplied by that order of things which shall be hereafter, when "all things are made new."

Passing from the height of the city, let us consider the *materials* of it and its walls. The description is as follows:—

"And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; the fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolyte; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprasus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass." (Rev. xxi. 18-21.)

The particulars of this description are so different from anything we have seen or know of in the present time, that we have nothing we can use, even by way of illustration, to simplify the description to our conceptions; but surely when we bear in mind that this wonderful city is "prepared of God"—that he is its "maker and builder," its transcendent structure cannot render its reality incredible; for unexampled though it be in our experience, it is not beyond the creative energy of the Almighty. "If it be marvellous in our eyes, should it also be marvellous in the eyes of the Lord of Hosts?"

The "*wall*" we are told was of "*jasper*," and its foundations were "garnished with (not built of) precious stones," the names of which are given, but it is their immense size which startles us. Again:—

"The city was of pure gold, like unto clear glass;" and "the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass." The gold with which we are familiar is not transparent; this gold, therefore, must be different from that with which we are acquainted. In what that difference consists it is impossible for us at present to form an opinion.

"The twelve gates were twelve pearls, every several gate was one pearl." So far as composition and structure is concerned, these may be true pearls; not indeed formed as are the pearls with which we are

Digitized by Google

cognisant; but the same almighty power which produces the pearls with which we are familiar, is able by direct creative act to produce those which John was favoured to behold as the gates of the New Jerusalem. Even so may the precious stones which adorn the foundations of the walls be produced. This is surely a reasonable view of the matter; and we cannot help thinking that had it not been overlooked, the hasty conclusion that the idea of literality was too absurd to be entertained, would have been avoided.

In this wondrous city there is "a river of the water of life," and "the tree of life." A difficulty presents itself regarding the reality of a river, when there is "no more sea:" but in all probability the difficulty arises out of our ignorance of the condition of things, when all is made new. When we consider that the power and skill of the Maker of this city are without limit, the difficulty in question may well be left to him.

Regarding "the tree of life," it is of importance to notice that it is not a single tree, but many. "In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river was the tree of life."

It has often been remarked that in this description we get a view of the "Paradise regained." There was a river in Eden, and there, also, was the "tree of life." These were literal, why not also those yet to come? That tree of life which was in the midst of the garden of Eden had the peculiar property of preventing death, else why was Adam put beyond access to it lest he should eat and live for ever? "The leaves of the tree" of life in the New Jerusalem are "for the healing of the nations." If the *leaves* are possessed of such salutary power, how much more so its fruit, which it yields every month?

But what need have "the nations of the saved" of such a tree, in a state of things when there shall be no more death? Without venturing to answer this question we would ask, And what need of the tree of life in the Garden of Eden? If man had not sinned he would not have died; and when he did sin he was put purposely beyond access to this tree. Before he was doomed to die he might have freely eaten of the tree of life; but unless he had eaten of that other tree "whose mortal taste brought death into the world" he would have been immortal. Why then the tree of life? The answer that meets the difficulty of the one case will do for the other. We are not sure if we know, but it seems possible that the fruit of the tree of life, may have been the means of deathless life to Adam; even so may the tree of life growing on each side of the river of the water of life in the New Jerusalem, to which "the nations of them that are saved" have access, be the means by which, to them, "there shall be no more death."

We cannot now enter fully into the question as to who shall constitute these nations. Suffice it to say that they are not those who were Christ's at his coming, for they had then put on immortality, and, during a thousand years, they have lived and reigned with Christ upon the earth; and, at the time of the vision, they dwell with him in the holy city. The faithful subjects of the kingdom during the thousand years, and those whose names are found written in the book of life, when "the rest of the dead" are raised at the end of the thousand years, we imagine, will form those nations of the saved, that walk in the light of the holy city, and bring into it their riches and honour. Saved they

Digitized by Google

are, though with a salvation inferior in kind to that of those who "reign for ever and ever." (Rev. xxii. 5.)

In favour of the idea that the state of things presented in the vision is pre-millennial, the fact is cited that Ezekiel had a vision of a city, having a river, and trees on either side of it, "the fruit of which was for meat, and the leaves thereof for medicine;" and that with the description of Ezekiel's vision there are associated circumstances which show its time to be *pre-millennial*. To this we reply, that while between the city of Ezekiel's vision and that of John there are various striking resemblances, yet the diversities are no less marked; and are of such a nature as to show that the visions relate to different cities. In the New Jerusalem there is "no temple; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it:" in the city described by Ezekiel—a temple is seen, and a description of it given. In the one city waters issue from under the threshold of the temple eastward, and flow into the [dead] sea: in the other city the river of water of life proceedeth out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. Other characteristics mark the city of Ezekiel's vision to belong to the millennial period, and that seen by John, to the eternal period beyond. Both cities are grand and wonderful constructions; and for ought we know may have some relation to each other; but, with our present knowledge it seems to us inadvisable to hazard conjectures thereon.

In conclusion it may not be out of place to notice an idea which is held by some writers on prophetic subjects, to the effect that the New Jerusalem will be suspended over the other Jerusalem; and will be the abode of the Lord Jesus Christ and his immortalised and glorified saints, while the other city will be the metropolis for restored Israel and the left of the nations. This idea, while presenting nothing in itself at variance with our conceptions of the future as revealed in the Bible, we have never been able to adopt, being unaware of a single text of Scripture which affirms it; while the statement that into the city of the New Jerusalem "the kings of the earth bring their glory and honour," seems insuperably opposed to it. In the vision which the apostle John had of this city (and we have no other description of it) he saw it "descending from God out of heaven," and the inference that he saw it descend to earth, is not only warranted by the phraseology, but also by the words which follow:—"And I heard a great voice saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God."

Our space is exhausted. The theme, however, is wonderfully inviting. Perhaps another pen may present us with thoughts suggested by its transcendent grandeur and glory. W. LAING.

THE "GOODWILL" OF GOD TO MAN.

LIKE a bright and glorious river whose waters broaden and deepen as they roll, so the "goodwill" of God to man is revealed in the Scriptures.

Before Christ came this "goodwill" manifested itself; it was ever leaping beyond the chosen people, as if impatient for the time of fuller

Digitized by Google

manifestation, ever giving sweet and precious reminders of its source and origin, mingled with promises which have yet to be realised.

"The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." It is in this fact, that man is the *work* of God, or to use New Testament language, "his offspring," that we find the source of his "goodwill;" and on this ground the very beast of the field is the object of his care: "Should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, and also much cattle?"

From the beginning then has the goodwill of God flowed towards man, and of necessity so, inasmuch as man is the creature and God the Creator.

But when we see "the babe" born in Bethlehem this river widens and expands, so that it becomes marvellous in our eyes.

"And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill toward men."

No new thing is revealed to us here; as we have already seen the "goodwill" of God must have flowed toward man from the hour of his creation. The fall hindered not this. The very ignorance and wretchedness that man was plunged into was but a greater claim on the divine compassion.

What then may we understand from the angels' song?

Simply this—that whereas from the beginning his tender mercies, his compassion, his "goodwill," was ever toward the creature, those tender mercies, that divine compassion, that goodwill was broadened and deepened when he saw his own beloved Son in the likeness of the creature.

The stream does not change its character though its volume is swelled by waters from another source, and God's heart of pity is moved afresh for man when he beholds the divine Word made flesh.

But yet a still further addition to the river of love and "goodwill" is revealed to us in 1 Timothy ii.

"I exhort, therefore, that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will (θελω to will, to wish, to desire) have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth; for there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man (rather *a* man) Christ Jesus."

How all-embracing is the goodwill of God as revealed to us in this Scripture; unchanged still in its character, still is it the compassion of the Creator for his creature, but wondrous is now the source from whence it flows.

Jesus (he who, being in the form of God, and who thought it not robbery to be equal with God, having taken the form of a servant and being found in the likeness of men) is now as a man at the right hand of God in heaven. This is now the source of the divine goodwill to man, for how can the Creator forget the creature when one bearing the creature's form is ever before him! How tender must the solicitude of God be for the race when one in that form has perfectly glorified him and is ever in his presence! It is on a man the eyes of God are ever fixed

Digitized by Google

with delight, and therefore towards men the river of divine goodwill ceaselessly flows, bearing to the joys of eternal life all who cast themselves unreservedly on its waters.

The glorious gift of God is indeed limited to those who desire and seek for it. The "goodwill" of God is universal, and embraces all men.

J. S. FREEMAN.

LIFE IN CHRIST.

"Christ our life."—COL. iii. 4.

WE have no words, O glorious Lord,
Sufficient to convey
Our praise for thine amazing word
Of "immortality."

But we adore thee for the light
Of wisdom, so profound,
That made it possible to write
"In Christ your life is found."

O thought sublime! the thinker GOD,
Almighty and All-wise,
That mortals from their clay abode
To endless life may rise!

For this grand thought, redemption's gem,
The brilliant prize of heaven,
We celebrate the peerless name
In whom that prize is given.

The LORD "our life!" Transcendent grace!
What more can thought enshrine?
We shall behold our Father's face,
His sons, in life divine!

THE DEATH OF THE BODY NOT THE EXTINCTION OF THE SOUL.

PART I.

"We shall not die." (Hab. i. 12.) "Our Saviour, Jesus Christ, . . . abolished death." (2 Tim. i. 10.) "The Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die." (2 Sam. xii. 13.) "The Lord hath chastened me sore; but he hath not given me over unto death." (Psa. cxviii. 18.) "Thou hast delivered my soul from death." (Psa. lvi. 13, and cxvi. 8.)

THE Scripture record of the origin of man tells us that God formed him of "the dust of the ground:" and, when thus far formed, the frame is called the "man." But the creative act was, nevertheless, not yet complete. God next breathed into man's "nostrils the breath of life, and man *became* a living soul."

Digitized by Google

So, then, though the frame of clay was heretofore, that is, in mid-process of creation, the "man," it cannot henceforth claim to be exclusively he. Man became now, what he was not previously—a "soul." Be it that the soul results from the action of the imparted spirit on the material organism, still that result is positive. Man has not merely become *life;* he has become, been made, *a soul.* He is now, in the integrity of his person, tripartite.

If the spirit of life afterwards be withdrawn from the organised body, what follows? Not surely of necessity the extinction of the soul, but rather its ceasing to be a distinctively and apparently *living soul* as related to earth. Deprived of its organs, it dies away from view; fails, so far as we can judge from observation, of its active and perceptive powers, yet is not quenched out of being—it is not blotted out of existence.

This is not proved a false faith, because the body of man, when despoiled of life by the loss of its soul, is once again spoken of as the "man." It is most natural and appropriate that that form of man which alone is cognisable as man by the human senses should be still designated *man.* It *is* so called by those who also speak of the lifeless body as the *mortal remains* of the deceased.

The record tells us furthermore that when God made man, he created him in his own "image," after his "likeness." Now, if only the material frame of man be the man, then are we compelled to conclude that the form of that frame is the form of God; and that exhausts the significancy of the terms "image" and "likeness,"—an idea too gross, we think, for acceptance by the reverently reflecting.

I do not deny the verity of death, as my opponent (Mr. Mill, in the September and October numbers of the RAINBOW) would insist. What we deny is a definition of death which makes it to denote a total personal extinction. If it were this, *a dead person* would really be an erroneous form of expression; for in such case there would in truth be no person in a state of death, that is, no *existing* subject of the condition. But the dead are spoken of as existing beings; for it is said that ere the last great judgment "the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them." And man may well be spoken of, in his mundane relations, as though he were but moulded matter, without ignoring his intrinsically nobler nature, of which the body is but the "vessel," however wonderfully formed.

These are the two points that we are really concerned to contend for —that man is not mere matter; and that his death is not of itself his utter extinction. The discussion of the question of his consciousness or unconsciousness during his state of temporary death, I desire at present to waive. With me that is only a question whether his sleep in death is absolutely profound or not. But I do esteem it to be of extreme importance to maintain, what I confidently believe to be the very truth, that man, in other than the material elements of his being, exists, and will exist, though it be not in outwardly living action and perception, until he shall be re-perfected in his personality, or meets with complete extermination in the second death. His first death most certainly is not the end of him. Otherwise he could never be the subject of a second death. Truly, "it is appointed unto men once to

Digitized by Google

die," as Mr. Mill quotes. "But after this the judgment,"—an after-death judgment. This, as clearly as can be, points to a continuity of being. For nothing in this passage is hinted of the *resurrection* to this judgment.

It is true, again, that the declared "wages of sin is death." But what death? Is it the temporal death which befalls all, the righteous and the wicked alike? and which is terminated by resurrection and followed by judgment? Or, is it not rather the eternal death, attended by utter destruction, which shall be awarded at the last judgment upon all whose names shall not be "found written in the Book of Life?" Shall they, whose lives have been ransomed from destruction by the vicarious atoning death of the Lamb of God, still have the penalty exacted from them, as though their souls had not been redeemed by most precious life-blood? Verily the debt of death, as the doom of sin, is cancelled by that sacrifice of the life of the Son of God, for all who in faith with penitence have fellowship with him in his crucifixion. And not only are the wages discharged, but in their stead we *have* "the gift of God—eternal life in Jesus Christ our Lord." If the death of the saints is to be regarded as the wages of their sin, there is this further startling anomaly to be accounted for: some there will be at the close of the present era of grace, who, though they will not have been exempt from personal sin any more than the saints of foregoing generations, will yet escape the payment of this penalty in their own persons; for, "we *shall not all sleep*." Why this disparity of treatment of the saints of God? Why, when the majority have to pay "the wages of sin," are others, who shall live at the end of that age, to be freed from the exaction? Is the blood of atonement of the Lamb *more* sufficient in their case than in that of their (this being so) much less happy predecessors?

"And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Not so. The passage is not in sequence, on the foregoing in Scripture. And an examination of the context of the latter will show, I think, that the reference here *is* to the first death falling universally on the whole race of man; the inheritors of Adam's nature, deriving from him the evil moral infection of that nature.

"None can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him: (for the redemption of their soul is precious [costly], and it ceaseth for ever:) that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption." What! cannot even the Lord Jesus Christ redeem his brethren that trust in him; though their souls are precious, and altogether otherwise irredeemable? Yea, and though *they* be not wholly spared from the experience of corruption, yet are they redeemed out of it.

The doctrine of the intermediate existence of the soul of man is in no wise opposed by "these Bible testimonies." And we are persuaded that we believe the affirmations of the remaining passages of that group, heading Mr. Mill's papers, quite as firmly, and perhaps as intelligently as he. I have contended for no such active consciousness in death as these texts speak of. I have not contemplated the soul asleep in death as praising the Lord, or as remembering him, or even as knowing anything. I deny not that men see corruption when they die, and that their thoughts perish on the day of their death. But how inappropriate

Digitized by Google

Eccles. ix. 5 is to prove even that unconsciousness, much more the extinction of man in death, has been well remarked upon in a letter in the July RAINBOW (p. 331). And Psa. cxlvi. 4, more probably refers to the destruction by death of a man's worldly designs (cf. Luke xii. 19, 20), than to his inability to *think* in his disembodied condition.

Now whilst these Scriptures certainly do not testify against the soul's continued existence in death, there are many places of Scripture which, we think, clearly witness in its favour.

St. Paul says (I quote Mr. Rotherham's rendering of 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3): "I know a man in Christ, who fourteen years ago (whether in [a] body I do not know,—God knows) was caught away, [even] such an one as this (whether in [a] body, or apart from the body I do not know,—God knows), that he was caught away into Paradise."

This is the language of St. Paul, who was probably as well instructed concerning the nature of man as any of us moderns. We perceive that he contemplates the possibility of a man, a living man, being parted from his body. He had undergone a personal experience which may have been *out of the body*. The man contemplated, observe, is *a man in Christ*, such an one, caught away. We are justified in supposing, then, that that man, Paul, may have been caught away, soul and spirit, to the third heaven, leaving his body for the time inanimate, soulless, *dead*. If this be thought difficult, not to say absurd, to imagine, we apprehend, that there is, at the very least, no less difficulty in imagining the Apostle transported bodily to the third heaven and Paradise, his body not yet changed from flesh and blood into the spiritual resurrection body. Says Bengel, "Apparently Paul *thought* himself to have been *out of* the body. Be that as it may; Claudianus Mamertus rightly infers from this that the higher part of man is immaterial; and that it was this, the soul itself, that was caught up. All that existed at all, save the body of Paul, was either *in* or *out of* the body." "The reason," he adds below, "for the apparent tautology is this, that even though he was in the body caught up to the third heaven, still it was possible for him in a further stage (of the trance) to have been caught up out of the body."

Earlier in this epistle we have the Apostle talking, in evident allusion to his death, of being *absent* from his body, which he speaks of as his earthly house of tabernacle, contrasting it with his house from heaven, with which he hoped to be clothed upon, doubtless, at the resurrection. And there, too, he speaks likewise of his inward and outward man, as distinguished each from the other. This whole passage, 2 Cor. iv. 16, to v. 10, deserves our careful consideration.

When the Apostle says, "Even though our outward man perish, yet our inward man is being renewed day by day," we think it will not be disputed that by his outward man he means his body. He had already just previously spoken of it as an *earthen vessel* (v. 7); and had represented himself as "bearing about *in the body* the dying of the Lord Jesus (v. 10), implying that only so much of his proper self as was comprised in that body, was thus undergoing the process of "dying." And by his "*inward man* he cannot mean his spirit, if by spirit is to be merely understood the breath, whose presence in the body gives it its life. We think it cannot but mean the soul,—renewed, indeed, by the

Digitized by Google

regenerating action of God's Holy Spirit. And if so (or, indeed, on any interpretation), here is the Apostle speaking of himself as a *two-fold* man. Nor is this the only place in which he thus speaks: cf. Rom. vii. 22, 23; where he opposes his "inward man" to his "members," constituting his dying body of flesh, vers 24, 25. Yet we do not suppose that any one will be bold enough to taunt St. Paul with regarding himself, whether living or dead, as two persons. Yet he certainly did regard himself as a dying man in respect of his bodily nature, and as an increasingly living man in respect of his spiritual nature, which we take to be his spiritually renewed soul. And it is hard, indeed, to believe that the Apostle apprehended that when his body, his outward man, should at last actually perish, his inward man, which up to that moment had been subject to renewal day by day, should then also perish with it. We hope and believe that the Apostle hoped better things for the inward man than this,—than *extinction of soul*, accompanying corruption of body in death, and absorption of spirit in God. He believed in the perishing of his outward man, whilst at the same time he exulted in the growing life (doubtless into eternity) of his inward man. "For the things that are seen," he says, "are temporal, but the things that are not seen (the hidden life amongst them), are (even already), eternal."

And then the Apostle proceeds to state the ground of his confidence that the momentary light burden of his affliction was working out for him a surpassing and still surpassing weight of glory. The affliction attached to *his body*, subject as yet to weakness, suffering, decay, and at length death. But he looked to have this poor, vile, afflicted body, this vessel of humiliation, in which his soul was for the space of this present brief life enshrined, replaced by a body of glory, in which his inner self would reign supremely, and for ever content and happy. And mark the terms he uses, discriminating either body from his indwelling self. "For we know," he says, "that if so be our earthly dwelling of that tent should be dissolved [taken down]"—what a strange way of speaking of his essential self, viz., as his earthly tent dwelling!—"we have a building," a substantial, durable structure, not a shifting, decaying, tent-abode, "from God" direct and not of human propagation, "a dwelling not made with hands,"—"that is to say," defines the inspired writer to the Hebrews, "not of this creation," nor that is, we take it, of material mould, "eternal," not during for a season only, as with our visible tent-home of flesh, "in the heavens," not here, ἐπίθειος, on earth Then surely this corrupting, evanishing, tabernacle of flesh, in which we but temporarily sojourn, is not our very soul, ourself, however intimately for a time linked with the soul, and in many respects identified with it. Not only is this so, because the soul *indwells* the body, and therefore is distinguishable from it, but also because the present body will be dissolved, or otherwise consumed, whilst the soul of the ransomed will but change its domicile, its vesture.

We may take comfort in this concerning *our hope*, groaning, sighing, "to clothe ourself over with our habitation which is from heaven." (*From* heaven; not, therefore, as Bengel reminds, to be interpreted of heaven itself as our future habitation, as some have suggested.) For much as the Apostle longed at a subsequent period of his toilsome

Digitized by Google

earthly career to depart from his life in the flesh, to be with Christ [in spirit] (Phil. i. 20-25), he retained at this time some hope of surviving in the flesh till the Lord should come in resurrection power for his saints. This hope seems to have possessed him fully, at the first, when writing to the Thessalonian Church, but to have gradually faded, and at length been surrendered, the Lord having probably shewed to him, as to St. Peter, that he would have to disrobe himself of his fleshly tenement ere HE should come in his glory. But as yet he is in doubt, for he adds, "If, indeed, we shall be found clothed (that is, in our mortal bodies), not naked (bereft of them)." This seems to be the very literal rendering of this clause, and so yields a sense in complete harmony with the context. The Authorised translation appears to express the very tautological notion that "If we shall be found clothed, we shall be so found." This assuredly cannot be the meaning the Apostle intended to convey. But he rather aimed in the words, as we think, to justify and amplify the thought of being clothed *over*. G. A. HAYWARD.

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

A PRAYER.

"The Lord is my helper."—HEB. xiii. 6.

O GOD of strength and power,
O God of boundless might,
In lifetime's darkest hour
Be thou our light.

Encompassed by the gloom
We scarce can feel our way;
Around us dangers loom:
Be thou our stay.

We know not where to fly,
We know not where to hide:
Bend down thy pitying eye,—
Be thou our guide.

Exposed to Satan's dart,
We almost faint and yield
Beneath its deadly smart;—
Be thou our shield.

In vain we search for peace,
And wearied in the quest
We would from roving cease;—
Be thou our rest.

Our souls look up to thee,
Our Saviour, King, and Friend,
Our help and guardian be
Until the end.

A. D. G.

Digitized by Google

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE SPIRIT OF THE BELIEVER.

DEAR SIR,—I feel much obliged to Mr. Hobson for the kind manner in which he has spoken of me in his letter in the RAINBOW of February last. I should not have thought it necessary to have made any reply to his argument there, but would have been satisfied to leave the matter to the judgment of your readers, were it not for what appears to me a most extraordinary misrepresentation of my views.

After referring to my opinion of the spirit in man as "something which belonged to God's own nature, coming forth from him, and going back to him at his will," he adds,—"and, of course, in the case of the dead, *gone back to him as fully and finally as in the case of the beasts that perish* or of those who are annihilated in the second death." (92.)

Where Mr. Hobson could have learned that it was my opinion that the spirit of the believer, after it had in death returned to God, never returned to the believer, I am utterly at a loss to know. He certainly did not learn it from anything I have ever said or written. For Mr. Hobson's information and that of others who have never read my work upon the subject, I take the liberty to add the following quotation:—

"Hence we see the exact position of the spirit of every believer during that reign of death which continues unbroken till the resurrection. It has been rendered back to God as the forfeit of original sin. It is, however, pledged to be restored by virtue of the covenant in Christ. It is, therefore, the possession of the believer in death by a promise that cannot be broken. He is allowed, nay commanded, to call it *his*, even in the solemn humbling hour when he is giving it up. His he knows it to be, kept safe for him. The separation is only for a time which, to the sleeper in the dust, shall seem to be but the twinkling of an eye. The hour he knows is coming when *his* spirit shall come back to him; and until that hour comes he knows that it is *his* spirit which he is commending into the hands of the God of redemption." ("Hades, 2nd Edition," p. 49.) This is certainly a very different view of the question from that which Mr. Hobson represents me to have taken.

HENRY CONSTABLE.

ANOTHER LIBEL ON KING DAVID.

DEAR SIR,—David in his day did and said many things not in keeping with the character of a child of God, and it is a striking evidence of the truthfulness of Scripture that it gives us a picture of the man as he was, without concealing his faults or seeking to justify them. This is no reason, however, why we should continue to lay to his charge evils of disposition and conduct of which, to say the least, it is very doubtful if he was guilty. In the RAINBOW for February (pp. 94, 95) two instances were referred to where slight defects in our Authorised rendering have led to his being blamed for cruelty and malevolence without good cause. By a singular coincidence, on another page of the same issue, a charge of cruelty and treachery combined is brought against him, and if I am not in-

Digitized by Google

truding too closely on your correspondent's path, I would ask leave to refer to it, as I consider it equally a misconception arising from an imperfect rendering of the original.

On page 87 it is said that on his deathbed David gave "directions for Solomon to cut off men whom he . . . had sworn should live." The case of Shimei is the one referred to; and your correspondent characterises the dying king's instructions to Solomon, as to the treatment of that dangerous person, as a "wretched subterfuge by which he thinks to destroy Shimei while saving his word of honour, as if it made any difference whether he or Solomon executed a decree originating with himself."

Now there is no question but that the language put into David's mouth in our common version of 1 Kings ii. 8, 9, naturally suggests such an idea. But there are very good grounds indeed for believing that our translators have done the dying man an injustice by neglecting in this passage a peculiarity in the use of a Hebrew particle with which they show themselves in other places to be quite familiar. I refer to the connective particle ו (vau), translated "but" in the last clause of verse 9,—"*but* his hoar head," &c. This little prefix has a variety of meanings, the two most common being simply "and" or "but," like the Greek affix δε. But there is this peculiarity about its use; that "after a negative or prohibitive particle" it has the power to carry the force of the negative preceding into the following clause which it brings into connection, and may thus be rendered "and *not*," or "neither, nor." (See Exod. xx. 4, 17; Lev. xix. 12; Deut. xxxiii. 6; Prov. xxx. 8, &c.)

"This *very common* use of the particle ו," says Parkhurst, "clears the sense of 1 Kings ii. 9. Let the reader attentively consider in the original Hebrew the eighth and ninth verses, and he will clearly perceive that the middle of the ninth, . . . must be understood parenthetically. 'And now do not hold him (Shimei) guiltless (for thou art a wise man and knowest what thou shouldst do unto him), NEITHER bring down his grey hairs with blood to the grave;' i.e., plainly for his *past* offences against David."

The best justification of such a rendering is to be found in what Solomon did (verses 35-46). I again quote Parkhurst:—"Accordingly Solomon held him not guiltless, by confining him to Jerusalem, under pain of death; and when he violated this condition, to which he himself had expressly assented and sworn, Solomon, for this *fresh* offence, *as a wise man*, caused him to die; and so Jehovah eventually returned Shimei's wickedness against David on his own head. Compare in the Hebrew, Deut. vii. 25; 2 Sam. i. 21, &c.; but especially Deut. xxxiii. 6—

> "Let Reuben live, and not die,
> And let (not) his men be few"—

where the ו prefixed to v. יָמֻת signifies 'and not, neither,' referring to the preceding אַל, just as in 1 Kings ii. 9."

This rendering is supported by the famous Hebraist Dr. Kennicott ("Remarks on Select Passages of the Old Testament"); and since his day by Dr. Adam Clarke and others.

So far, then, from David instigating his son to break a solemn oath made by himself, he rather bids him respect it, even in the case of a man whom he esteemed deserving

Digitized by Google

of death, adding, however, the caution to the young king to keep his eye on the offender, and put him under such restraint as he thought right.

Yours sincerely,
M. W. STRANG.
Mount Florida, Glasgow.

THE SECONDARY QUESTION.

DEAR SIR,—Most of those who believe in the final destruction of the impenitent, will join Mr. Hobson in the ardent wish that all may come to agree on the secondary question of the intermediate state. Glad am I to read your note of invitation to its thorough discussion. That there are two sides to this question is evident, and we cannot do otherwise than treat with the greatest possible respect the upholders of each. That there seem both Scripture and reason in the views so strongly insisted on by Mr. Hobson, none can fairly deny; but at the same time we must be careful not to mistake a survival of the soul or spirit and its continued individuality with the popular notions of its consciousness and capacity. Many Scriptures appear to teach that when the spirit returns to God, individuality is still retained; and more than this, the spirit is identified with the man and *in some secondary sense is regarded as the man.* How else are we to understand such well-known passages as "absent from the body," "putting off this my tabernacle," and the like? Let us willingly admit the force of these Scriptures, even though we be driven into difficulties. Common honesty in dealing with the Bible demands this. Nevertheless, spiritual survival and soul individualism, do not necessitate consciousness or capacity. *Now* we know that the spirit is nothing without the body, any more than the body without the spirit. They are formed for each other. God *can* give this independent capability to the spirit if he chooses; but present experience is a strong presumptive argument against it. Scripture alone must decide this for us. Has it done so? If it has, then I must confess myself staggered in the presence of a Book claiming to come from God as a divine revelation to men. What is the *general teaching* if the Book on the subject of man's nature—the soul-spirit, the intermediate state, and the resurrection? To quote the answers the Scriptures supply to these questions would be enough to fill an entire number of the RAINBOW. This we are quite safe in asserting,—that the teaching of the Scriptures, with a few seeming exceptions, ignores the idea that the spirit of man is the personal and responsible being; the body is the person whether living or dead. The man lives, expires, is buried, and rises again, either to live or die for ever.

This also we may boldly assert, that to deny this Bible doctrine and to insist on the soul or spirit being the human personality, and possessing consciousness in the intermediate state, is to transform the Bible into a book of enigmas, if not to make it unintelligible on the subject.

Let those who maintain this spirit consciousness and soul capability in the intermediate state, read the Bible through in the light of such a belief, and just see what they can make of it. It would be a profitable work for Mr. S. Minton to engage in, that of issuing a pamphlet similar to the convincing one called "Scripture re-written to prove the Eternity of Evil," just to prove how much of the Bible would

Digitized by Google

have to be re-written in order to make man anything else than a bodily organism, or the intermediate state anything more than a condition of sleep for the man in the dust of the earth.

Blandford. J. J. Hobbs.

THE TRUTH AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Dear Sir,—I have some reason for thinking that it will be scarcely superfluous to ask if all of us who have, or ought to have, an active interest in Sunday-school work realise the immense importance of the careful instruction of Sunday scholars in the great truths of conditional immortality and the coming of Christ as our hope. I refer of course to Sunday-schools where such teaching would be in harmony with the theology of the churches with which they are connected.

But if one thinks of the many churches whose pastors have made open avowal of belief in "life in Christ," and where, presumably, that great truth, and the truths which cluster round it, not only may, but are expected to be taught in the schools connected therewith, surely there ought to be a very large number of children now receiving clear instruction in these great truths; the influence of whom upon the faith of the rising generation in after years may be great indeed.

But is it so? Are we on whom the carrying on of this school work devolves, fully alive to the importance of teaching these truths to the children? I confess to a fear that we are not. I have a fear that some of us are disposed to regard these as controversial matters, which it is better not to bring under the notice of the children, and content ourselves by putting before them those truths concerning God and Christ and man which are commonly accepted in the churches. But surely, remembering that in thousands of Sunday-schools the immortality of the soul and kindred doctrines are taught with the greatest diligence as primary truths, we, who think by the grace of God we know better, should with at least equal diligence and persistence teach immortality in Christ as *the* primary truth, and his coming as the Christian Hope.

I admit there are difficulties in the way. We are in danger of being to an extent stultified by the literature which circulates from our school libraries, in our school hymn-books, and in tracts, as gifts to the children, obtainable only from orthodox sources; but surely this should make our oral teaching the more unequivocal.

There are no deep-rooted prejudices in these young minds, forbidding lodgment to the seed of truth; but we have in them minds without bias, and ready to receive truth so plainly scriptural as that to which I refer.

All that is said of the importance of Sunday-school work generally seems to me to apply with two-fold force to schools where the truth concerning immortality may be taught.

Is it not to be regretted that Sunday-school tuition is committed so largely to young Christians? Might not the greater knowledge, the more extended experience of older Christians, in more cases, find in Sunday-schools a channel of great usefulness?

I commend these matters to the consideration of my fellow-workers,

Digitized by Google

and any who ought to be workers, in Sunday-schools.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,
A TEACHER.

THE DEATH OF THE SOUL.

"Be not afraid of them that kill the body, &c., but fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." —Matt. x. 28.

DEAR SIR,—In the December number of your most valuable monthly your correspondent "Z," page 569, quotes the above passage to show that "the soul" must be something more than the surrounding atmosphere. Well, so it clearly is, because it is the same word rendered "life" in the thirty-ninth verse of the chapter—but then that does not make a living entity of the soul, or life. *When* the body dies, the life or soul, or spirit (whatever it may be called) goes to God who gave it. God is the great fountain of life; all came from him, and all return to him.

The Scriptures nowhere speak of any existence after this life, except of those who have eternal life granted to them in Christ; and St. Paul, speaking clearly of such in 1 Cor. xv., shows that this eternal life is not enjoyed till the resurreetion. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; howbeit the spiritual is not first, but the natural, and afterward the spiritual; for this mortal must put on immortality."

The latter portion of this chapter goes clearly to show that the grave remains the victor over the body or the entire being until the resurrection; and that the glorious or spiritual body which is to enjoy the blessedness of the new creation is the body which was sown a natural body; and that it neither refers to the soul nor to the spirit, which had been separated, or kept apart from, the body during its sleep in the grave.

When will sober-minded students of the blessed word get rid of their theories of ghosts, which to my mind are as weak and mischievous as that of spiritualism?

Yours faithfully,
A SUBSCRIBER FROM THE FIRST.

LITERATURE.

The Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ Elucidated on the principle of permitting the Prominent Symbols to become the Exponents of the Events and Phenomena with which they are associated. By General H. Goodwyn. Psa. cxlv. 10—12. London: Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row.

THE inexhaustible Apocalypse has found another commentator, and in this instance a key has been used which appears to unlock the treasures of that wonderful book in a manner which will at once satisfy and delight many readers. An intelligent study of General Goodwyn's remarkable work will prove that he has kept his selected principle of interpretation steadily in view, and that he has amply justified that principle by striking quotations and illustrations from Scripture. Something of the holy joy which he experienced in writing this volume will, we cannot doubt, be felt by those who shall read it. In these days, when the failure of

Digitized by Google

human governments everywhere is the daily text of the world's newspapers, it must be a source of pleasure to recall the motto-text of this book: "All thy works shall praise thee, O Lord, and thy saints shall bless thee: *they shall speak of the glory of* THY KINGDOM, and talk of thy power; to make known to the sons of men his mighty acts, and the glorious majesty of his kingdom."

It is to the coming and character of this glorious kingdom that our gifted brother devotes his heart and mind, and the result is a study of divine truths in which the loving heart of the author moves, and the light of his well-furnished intellect shines. The regret which we should otherwise have felt at the impossibility of an extended notice of this work, from the pressure upon our space, is sensibly diminished by the conviction that many earnest Christians, who are longing for the promised kingdom, will buy the book, and carefully read it for themselves, which it so well deserves, and will so fully reward.

With one or two brief extracts we leave the work to speak for itself.

CHARACTER OF THE REVELATION.

"The Book we are about to consider is a compendium or concentrated summary, *in one connected series*, of the once veiled purposes of the Most High scattered through the Old Testament, but which now receive a clear signification through the recorded results of the momentous central action of the Godhead, the death and resurrection of the Son of God. This Book is the closing chapter of the second volume of the Bible, revealing the object towards which all the events and histories of the former portions have tended, together with the ultimate destiny of the world and its inhabitants. It is to be accepted as having been written in due order; that the events in the various visions are recorded in the sequence of their occurrence with regard to the past, present, and future. An attentive observer of the judicial ways and moral principles of God in the Old Testament, who has traced the course of those ways and noted the unchanging nature of those principles, will not fail to recognise in this book a parallel record of their action towards the professing Church, Israel nationally, and this present evil world, consequent on the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and the results arising from the reception or rejection of that revealed fact. Moreover, he will be led to confess such judicial action to be morally necessary previous to any announcement of the indispensability of the assumption of governmental power by the Son of God and Man; who at his first advent gave himself a judicial sacrifice, in order to the reconciliation of sinners unto God, and to the gift of peace through a righteous dominion of creation."

FINAL DESTRUCTION OF ALL EVIL.

"It is said of the Devil that he shall be 'cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.' It is also said of him that he shall be destroyed (Heb. ii. 14). It has been consequently urged that 'destruction' means 'eternal torment.' But there are three reasons why this cannot be. (1) The word 'destruction,' in its absolute application to life, to all organisms, or to whatever has constitution, form, function, or utility, means 'to unbuild, to pull down, to separate violently into its constituent parts, to break up the structure or organic

Digitized by Google

existence of;' syn. 'to consume, extirpate, extinguish.' (*Webster.*) (2) Because the literal meaning of the Greek original, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, is incorrectly rendered 'for ever and ever.' (3) Because the Devil is cast into a lake of fire, a component part of the earth that in Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 4, and 2 Peter iii. 10, 13, is said to be reduced to its original nothingness, 'no place being found for it' in the New Creation—this too notwithstanding the unwillingness of men to believe that God, having created all things in order to the accomplishment of the good pleasure of His eternal counsel in the work of redemption and the glory of his Son, is unwilling to uncreate that which *will have fulfilled* its Creator's intent.* Nor has it been taken into account that at the first all things were 'very good;' but, 'the way of God having been corrupted' by Satan through sin, it is now the avowedly determinate purpose of the Most Holy to demolish by utter consumption every created atom that has been tainted with sin. To this end and its judicial accomplishment did he give his Son unto death.† Of these three reasons the second only requires further comment."

The Crisis at Constantinople. A Sermon by W. Stewart Ross, Incumbent of Christ Church, Belfast. Belfast: Mayne, Donegal Square.

We welcome Mr. Ross as a clear thinker on the Eastern question. He sees the destiny of Russia, as foreshadowed by Ezekiel, and faithfully declares his convictions. He looks, as all who are taught of God must look, for the advent of Christ as the divine solution of all our difficulties. It is a noble sermon.

Conditional Immortality. An Essay contributed to the *Revue Théologique.* Part 2nd. *October*, 1876. By E. Petavel-Ollif.

Since our friend left these shores and resumed the position of a Swiss pastor, he has had to combat many prejudices among the theologians of Calvin's land. "Les denegations, les imputations, et les insinuations:" such are the weapons of his adversaries; and even the *quasi* arguments of M. Bonifas, the only opponent who seems to have presented an honest front, indicate the adoption of a position considerably in arrear of that now accepted in England. We do not mean that Geneva has ever been lacking in free-thinkers; but in that more reverential and expansive representation of the God of the Bible, based upon an affectionate study of the oracle, which during the past half-dozen years has been running like wild-fire through the churches of our own country,—in this respect we are tempted to think that England has again set that example of leading thought for which John Milton gave her credit two centuries back,—all the more honour is reflected back from the escutcheon of our indomitable ally and faithful brother; for "the hardest fight is highest crown'd;" and happy shall we be if in the coming spring gatherings he cheer us with a personal testimony of ever-increasing success. Our English readers do not require to be reminded of the forms of thought wherein Dr. Petavel's strength lies. Nor, indeed, are his national brethren in the ministry ignorant of them either. Only they are especially anxious to keep out of his reach. "We has-

* Rev. iv. 11; Heb. i. 10-12.
† John i. 29; Heb. ix. 26; 1 John iii. 8.

Digitized by Google

ten," says the Editor of the *Revue*, after a touch-and-go reference to the first part of the Essay, "to pass on to a point far more grave;" "as if," rejoins Petavel, "a question of more gravity could possibly be found for man than the alternative of existence or non-existence." And he then quotes Shakespeare, "To be or not to be—that is the question" In his removal of sundry philological molehills which some persons are still disposed to regard as mountains, we may select in conclusion the reference to the term *kolasis* in the Wisdom of Solomon (xiv. 10), where it is said that the false god [an inanimate block of wood or stone] shall be punished (κολασθήσεται) together with him that made it. This is the term which, occurring in Matthew xxv. 46, has so often been felt as a difficulty.

The Old Church. A Short Allegorical Sketch of the Anglican Church from the Romish Period to its Prospective Disestablishment. By Walter J. Miller. Hamilton, Adams, & Co.

KEENLY satirical and clever, with an undertone of profound reverence for truth. The Author's conclusion —"the old Church free"—fervently, as well as poetically, utters a prayer to which intelligent Christians must say "Amen!"

The Homiletic Quarterly. No. 1, January 1877. London: Richard D. Dickinson, Farringdon Street.

WE find that the enterprising publisher of the Theological Quarterly has put forward another candidate for public favour under the above title. As may be supposed from its name, the interpretation of Scripture forms the main portion of its contents. Thus we have in it "Homiletic Sketches" of various books of the Bible: articles on "Biblical Exposition," "Bible Manners and Customs," &c. In "Half-hours with the Talmud" we are introduced to a just idea of a book very often spoken of and very often little understood. Some of the legends here brought to our notice are beautiful, and most of them of interest. The journal will be found to give many valuable hints and ideas for the drawing up of sermons and other addresses.

God's Ordination of his own Ministers. By Rev. G. W. Straton.

Mr. Straton sees the truth and utters it fearlessly, as a faithful servant of his Lord.

NOTICE.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY *of the Dedication of St. Paul's Chapel, Hawley Road, Kentish Town.* On Wednesday, March 21st, the church under the pastoral care of Mr. Edward White completes its twenty-fifth year of testimony to the truth of Life in Christ only. It is proposed to hold a Congregation on that day at seven o'clock in the evening, at which addresses on this great subject will be delivered by Mr. R. W. Dale, M.A., of Birmingham, and by Mr. Edward White and others, reviewing the history of the controversy, and urging on the churches liberty of confession in this direction. The kindly presence of Christian people sympathising with the object is requested.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

APRIL, 1877.

MODERN UNBELIEF.

II.—ITS CAUSES.

THE physician will not be satisfied with observing disease and describing its symptoms; he will proceed to investigate its causes. The prevalence of unbelief may well suggest inquiries as to its sources; and we are, therefore, prepared to hear Dr. Ellicott earnestly asking—"To what causes or influences can we probably ascribe the prevalence of suspended belief, and the increase of difficulties in heartily accepting the facts and teachings of Christianity?" His answers have been already indicated; and while regarding them as referring to causes which claim most serious consideration, we cannot accept them as anything like full and satisfactory. He himself does not so regard or present them; but speaks of the three causes to which he directs attention, as some of "the many which may be assigned." Even these three are but briefly dealt with: the third, the most common, difficult, and interesting of all, is, perhaps, the least satisfactorily treated. Sufficient, however, is said to show that (1) "the tone and direction of recent historical criticism; (2) the deductions that have been drawn from the real or alleged discoveries of modern science; and (3) the moral and metaphysical difficulties which have been supposed to be involved in or connected with the fundamental doctrines of Christianity," are powerfully operating in the production of scepticism.

On the first of these causes we briefly remark that it is useless and unreasonable to expect or ask for any different treatment of the documents which compose our sacred books than that which other ancient records receive. Both abroad and at home writers have arisen who remorselessly apply, both to the Old and New Testaments, the canons of criticism by which they would test the authenticity and worth of any other ancient literature. It may be, however,

Digitized by Google

that in some instances the treatment has been more severe and less impartial: prejudice exercises unperceived influence, and unfavourable conclusions are thus reached.

With reference to the second cause, one or two observations must suffice. The reasonings of certain scientists have unquestionably led to doubt and perplexity, and even to positive unbelief. But truth cannot be opposed to truth; and where there is opposition, or rather apparent opposition, between the theories of science and the traditional teachings of the Bible, we believe it must be the result of partial and erroneous views on either one side or the other, or on both.

Both these causes, originating with educated and active intellects, and thence descending to leaven ordinary minds, demand careful and honest consideration, and can be met only by thorough investigation and sound argument.

The third cause includes a great extent and variety of influences. The difficulties to which Dr. Ellicott here refers are felt by men of all classes. I have found them existing and working in minds of widely differing calibre and culture. In hours of earnest and solemn conversation I have heard them expressed by educated and deeply thoughtful men. I have listened to them from the God-fearing woodman as he has rested upon his axe; and discussed them with the fiercely-infidel tramp in the filthy lodging-house. Who, whatever the extent of his knowledge or the measure of his faith, is superior to all "the moral and metaphysical difficulties" which are connected with Christianity,—especially with Christianity as commonly taught and understood? To this subject I shall again and again incidentally refer as we proceed.

Before passing on to present some of the results of my own observation and inquiry, I would distinctly acknowledge the existence of a fact which is the parent of infidelity in some of its forms, and, probably, to some extent, its nurse in others. I refer to that state of our moral nature—call it by what name you will—which renders us more or less averse to holy and humbling truth. Whatever explanations may be offered, the fact remains,—that man is unwilling to receive any teaching which tends to convince him of sin and humble him in his own estimation; or to accept of any salvation which involves self-denial and necessitates the love and practice of holiness. To what extent this exists and operates in particular individual cases the Searcher of hearts alone can judge; but that in some degree it is common to all men, we cannot doubt; so that, *à priori*, we might expect such a revelation as that contained in the Scriptures to find difficulties in obtaining acceptance. These difficulties, however, become increased and intensified by facts and influences so associated with Christianity as to be commonly supposed to be among its integral parts or legitimate fruits. These are numerous and would admit of abundant proof and illustration; at present I can scarcely do more than point them out.

Digitized by Google

I. In many instances unbelief results from *the corruptions of Christianity*. The mass of our fellow-countrymen know little of pure abstract Christian truth. Their ideas and opinions are derived from certain supposed embodiments and manifestations of its principles, practices, and spirit. In proportion as these are false and corrupt, therefore, erroneous and unfavourable impressions are received. It is beyond question that many of these presentations of the religion of Christ are false; caricatures apparently drawn by the hands of enemies, rather than faithful photographs produced by the light of truth.

(1.) Who can deny the existence of *Ecclesiastical corruptions*? Are there not organisations among us which bear no resemblance to anything shadowed forth in the New Testament; and offices and orders of which Christ's first disciples knew nothing? From the Church of Rome through Protestant sects; from the Pope to the lowest member of a professional priesthood or ministry, systems exist and principles operate which present Christianity in aspects which become hindrances and stumbling blocks to thousands. There are not a few to whom the great ecclesiastical organisation of which Dr. Ellicott is so distinguished a dignitary, is itself one active cause of unbelief; and while the learned and amiable prelate in his personal character is a living epistle testifying to the truth of the gospel, yet in his official position and surroundings he is a perplexity to many who judge of Christianity, not by the teachings of the New Testament, but by the outward and visible forms which profess to set it forth.

(2.) *Ceremonial corruptions* produce similar effects. We cannot question the sincerity of many who tell us that in the exercise of plain common sense they find it impossible to see in what appears to them religious mummeries, any evidence of a Divine revelation. The performances of the font, the altar, and elsewhere, far from impressing them with convictions of truth and inspiring them with feelings of reverence, awaken suspicion and contempt. To such minds sacerdotal vestments are no means of grace, but rather occasions of offence. The black gown of the Dissenting minister, the white surplice of the Conformist clergyman, and the gaudy robes of the Romish priest, not only fail to commend religion to their intelligent attention, but tend to prejudice their understandings against its rightful claims.

(3.) But most powerfully of all, *doctrinal corruptions* prove occasions of absolute unbelief or painful unsettlement. Not only in the writings of Paul, but through all the books of Scripture are "things hard to be understood." Many of these constitute formidable "moral and metaphysical difficulties" to the intelligent exercise of faith. As though these were not sufficiently numerous and grave, however, theology has multiplied and intensified them a hundredfold. By conjectures and inferences, by mystifications and misinterpretations, by literalisings and spiritualisings, it has filled

Digitized by Google

the way of truth with a drift of stumbling stones, and darkened the pure rays of heavenly light with veils of human tradition. Witness the endless dogmas in reference to the Trinity, the Atonement, Election, Regeneration, the Sabbath, the Kingdom of Christ, Future Punishment, and other subjects, which have been proclaimed as Divine verities, and which men are charged to receive and believe without doubt or questioning, on pain of eternal damnation. While in every age and every Church many will be found who will professedly accept any creed which their leaders prescribe and use any formula which they may frame, others, at the same time, will be found sufficiently independent to exercise their own judgment, and openly or secretly refuse to believe or say otherwise than that judgment approves. I was recently present at an Established Church service when the Athanasian Creed was read. My impression was that the officiating clergyman performed his part falteringly; and I do not think I was mistaken in believing that many of the educated and intelligent members of the congregation manifested by their looks and manner a repugnance to the dogmas and denunciations of this "Catholic Faith."

While faith can embrace mysteries which exceed the reach of reason, it cannot truly receive anything which stands opposed to reason, especially if it is also revolting to those natural feelings which God Himself has implanted in the heart. Yet this is just what men tell us many of these dogmas are, and which unfortunately they have been taught to regard as essential parts of that religion which they are called upon to accept as a revelation of Heavenly wisdom and mercy. Alas, too long has theology presumed "to fill up in detail that which is told in outline only—to define that which has not been defined—to explain that which has not been explained—to clear up that which has been left obscure."* In doing so it has heaped upon the pearls of truth mountains of rubbish, and insisting upon the reception of these as expositions of the Divine mind it has provoked the rejection of the whole. "It is not," says the Rev. G. R. Gleig, "to the misuse of the discoveries which have been made by modern science that we are disposed to attribute exclusively the hesitating temper into which, on religious questions, modern society has fallen. The misfortune—for a terrible misfortune it is—may be traced back quite as much to the dogged obstinacy of worn-out orthodoxy as to other causes."

George Herbert has a proverb which says, "Some men plant an opinion which they seem to eradicate." It is doubtless true that some destroy the faith which they profess to preach, and develop the unbelief which they aim at rooting out. Have we not again and again listened to preachers whose bald utterances and flimsy arguments have filled our minds with doubts as to the truth of the Gospel itself? Do not some of us look back with sadness, fearing

* The Duke of Argyll.

Digitized by Google

what unbelief we may ourselves have occasioned, in days past, by the vehemence and positiveness with which we preached dogmas we have since utterly renounced?

While writing this paper some illustration of the paragraphs just penned has been furnished by the testimony of an unusually intelligent and well-read working man, whom I have long known, and with whom I have been conversing on this subject. His father was a rigid Calvinist, his mother a Primitive Methodist. As early as twelve years of age he found himself unable to believe many of the doctrines which they held. A sore conflict began in his mind. The Methodist preaching largely permeated with the dogma of eternal hell-fire distressed and stumbled him. "I look back," he says, "upon twenty years of my life with feelings of horror. I knew not where to gain help and light and comfort; and had I not at length by earnest and independent search after truth obtained, direct from the Scriptures, brighter and happier views of God and his purposes than those which were pronounced orthodox, I should have sunk into utter infidelity."*

(4.) *Fanatical or exaggerated representations and professions with respect to experimental religion* are not without their share of influence in exciting doubt as to the reality of religion altogether. We dare not limit the Holy One in his operation upon the human heart. The modes in which he works and the power he exercises, it is not for man to trace and estimate. With reverence we acknowledge his mighty and merciful influence in humbling, teaching, purifying, and comforting the souls of men. But we are not required to believe that he works in all the ways which men imagine; or to recognise as the operation of his Spirit all the effects which some tell us they experience. So utterly contrary are some of these to the known laws of nature and the common facts of life that calm observers cannot but regard them as delusions, which it is impossible to believe have their origin in truth and power that come from God. Many of the statements made in religious conferences, or published in books on the subject of conversion, personal holiness, and the power of faith, may well awaken doubts as to the sanity of their authors, or the truth of the religion they profess.

(5.) That infidelity is produced, or confirmed, by *the inconsistent lives of unworthy professors of religion* is a fact so generally acknowledged that we need only refer to it as one of "the many causes

* Since this paragraph was written I have seen a lecture entitled "*Eternal Punishment proved from the Divine Attributes, the Relations of Man, and the Holy Scriptures.*" It is recommended by several eminent orthodox ministers, who express the opinion that the doctrines it enforces "lie very near the root of all Christian virtue and religion." The author asserts that "the Atonement and the very being of God stand or fall" with the doctrine of everlasting sin and suffering; and in support quotes Dr. Spring as saying, "It is in every view fundamental to the Christian system, essential to the Gospel, and necessary to its existence." Can we wonder that such teaching causes unbelief?—J. S.

Digitized by Google

which may be assigned." This evil effect is naturally increased when those who exercise it are loud in their professions; or prominent in their position in the Church. It is, therefore, with truth and candour that the chief journal in the Bishop's own cathedral city of Gloucester says:—"In addition to the causes of scepticism enumerated by the Bishop, there is another for which the clergy themselves are specially answerable. So long as thinking men see the sacred calling adopted simply as an easy means to earn a respectable living—so long as clergymen are found quarrelling among themselves about the cut of a garment or the colour of a window, while all the time according to their own preaching immortal souls are sinking unsaved into perdition—so long as the 'successors of the Apostles' are clothed with purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day, while poor Lazaruses in scores lie uncared-for at their gates—just so long will men doubt the truth of the Gospel which is proclaimed on the lips but denied by the life. Happily there are in all denominations hundreds of devoted men who counteract the influence of such sights; but, nevertheless, the influence has a mighty and malefic effect."* These strictures must not be limited to the clergy of the establishment; nor to any priesthood or ministry only: among the laity as well as the clergymen are to be found whose lives belie the religious professions of their lips, and who are consequently stumbling-blocks in the way of others.

(6.) This naturally leads us to the further remark, that in *the divisions and contentions; in the narrow-minded and little-hearted bigotry; in the petty persecutions; and in the eager and almost fierce spirit of proselytism*, too often prevailing among Christians, causes of unbelief may be found. We cannot wonder that men should question the heavenly origin and character of a religion in connection with which so much that is illiberal, unmanly, and despicable exists. With what contempt must intelligent, generously-minded, and honourable men of the world, look upon some of our ecclesiastical quarrels; or mark the bitter fruits of our uncharitableness; or watch us compassing, like the Pharisees of old, "sea and land to make one proselyte."

II. *Certain theories as to the claims and designs of the Scriptures* have undoubtedly perplexed and repelled many thoughtful and intelligent inquirers. It will be sufficient to mention two or three.

(1.) *Some theories of inspiration* which thinking men find it impossible to reconcile not merely with certain facts relating to ancient manuscripts and varying translations, but with some things forming part of the Book itself.

(2.) *The theory that the Bible teaches scientific truth;* and consequent interpretations of its statements, at manifest variance with the most plainly demonstrated facts of science.

(3.) *Theories as to the mission and power of Christianity to*

* *Gloucester Journal*, October 28th, 1876.

Digitized by Google

convert the world, through the instrumentality of man, in the present age. Ignoring to a fearful extent the second coming of Christ, and the glorious and gracious results that will follow, the modern Church is asserting that the Gospel as made known by human agency is Divinely designed to regenerate the whole earth. A second paradise is to bloom as the fruit of the Church's labours. History affords us no encouragement to believe that the Gospel will triumph universally and permanently, wherever it is carried. Neither the present aspect of Christendom, nor the present condition of missions to the heathen gives the least ground to expect the fulfilment of these vast expectations. "If this be the mission of Christianity," say thousands of observant reasoners, "then through the more than eighteen centuries of its existence it has failed; and notwithstanding all its stupendous efforts and all its loud proclamations of success, it is failing still: and judging it by this test we are in doubt as to its divine power and truth."

Not only has the dignity of Christianity been lowered, but discredit and suspicion have been brought upon its professions and claims by *the means often employed for its support and propagation.* How unworthily has the Church sought the power, patronage, and pay of the State! In how many ways has she denied her crucified Lord that she may gain the smile of earthly potentates! With what mean and incessant importunity is she crying to the world, "Give! give!" To what lower motives does she appeal, and what questionable and even disreputable means does she use to support her professional ministry, sustain her complicated and costly organisations, build her temples, and work her varied machinery for the aggrandisement of sects, or at best for the accomplishment of her splendid but vain dream—the evangelisation of the world! Many Christians little know with what ridicule and contempt such proceedings are regarded. I know one instance where a professional gentleman entered into a curious calculation as to the cost involved in the case of every Jew said to be converted by the agency of some particular society. Others, I know, analyse the treasurer's reports of our great religious organisations, and freely discuss the ways in which the Christian church obtains and expends her vast funds.

In how many instances has so-called *religious education* implanted the seeds of unbelief? This is a question no human being can solve: but thousands upon thousands could testify that their repugnance to religion could be traced back to the unfortunate impressions they received when Christianity was first presented to their young minds. Facts the most astounding and apparently incredible were forced upon their belief without reason or explanation. Statements which appeared contradictory or absurd; sentiments opposed to the best feelings of their young hearts; and precepts the why and wherefore of which they could not comprehend; were set before them as coming direct from heaven. The Catechism was a task book: the Bible lesson was probably given by a

Digitized by Google

frowning parent, or a harsh teacher who held the sacred volume in one hand and administered cane cuts with the other: the Sabbath was a burden; and public worship a weariness. Sunday-schools and Bible-classes have not proved an unmixed good. Such facts as those to which Mr. Dunn has recently called our attention may well lead us to closer inquiry as to the working and influence of these institutions.

I cannot close these remarks without reference to what I fear has proved and will continue to prove a cause of infidelity, viz., *excessive religious excitement.* Inquiry will show that in many cases unbelief is the result of reaction from unnatural stimulation of mind and heart. Imagine the case of a young and susceptible mind: tender in conscience, alive with emotion; but immature in judgment and very imperfectly acquainted with truth. How easy under certain conditions to awaken in such a soul distressing convictions of sin, and fearful alarm as to future destiny: how easy, too, under certain conditions to calm this tempest, and inspire something like comfort and peace. But how probable that such spiritual experience, the result of the preacher's persuasions and appeals, will, under other influences to which such an experience will inevitably be exposed, fail, and subside into indifference. Such indifference will often be accompanied by processes of reasoning which will aim at its own justification, and these will land the soul in scepticism. In the religious sensationalism to which I here refer, I cannot but see danger of such results as fanaticism, mental and moral paralysis, and some stages of unbelief.

In closing this paper I must confess that as the causes of unbelief to which I have directed attention, have been observed and pondered by my own mind for some years past, my astonishment has been, not that there is so much suspended belief and confirmed infidelity, but that there is not more.

Some *Facts, Inquiries, and Suggestions* as to the best means of dealing with this state of things, may form the subject of a brief concluding paper. * J. S.

CHRISTIAN KINDNESS.*

"Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you. Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children."—EPH. iv. 32; v. 1.

HERE we have the root and the fruit. A Christian brother was speaking of a certain minister, who was counselling young men not to make a profession of religion, but to be good, and honest, and temperate, and all that sort of thing,—heathen morality, in fact, and nothing else. The heathen teachers taught all that, and taught

---

***A short week-evening address, by W. Leask, reported in a local paper, and printed here simply because of its practical character.**

Digitized by Google

it as well as some modern teachers do. The worst of it is, that if things have no root, they won't grow. You cannot manage to get foliage or fruit where there is no root. And if you attempt to put on these moralities and call them the fruits of Christianity, you fail. They are not so. But if you take the Divine plan and work from the heart outwards toward the circumference, you will get fruit, and foliage, and flowers, and all that is good and beautiful.

Now, that is what Divine grace within us does. It gives the fruits of the Spirit. We also read here what are the fruits of the flesh. The Apostle says: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, be put away from you, with all malice;" and then he goes on to say, "And be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." That is the reason. God forgives men; and then it follows: "Be ye followers of God as beloved children." There is no difficulty whatever in a man who is in Christ being all that virtue requires, and all that morality requests. He is in Christ, and he becomes Christlike. The fruits of the Spirit are borne by him: love, peace, joy, uprightness, rectitude, temperance, and purity. These things are in such a man, because the man is in Christ.

You will never succeed in accomplishing an external reformation except you begin in the heart. You know all that, my dear brethren; but I bring it before you just now as occurring in connection with my subject. First, then, observe what it is that God calls Christians: "Dear children;" "beloved children," is the expression that is used. "God's beloved children;" his family, in his Son, having the Father's Spirit within them, admiring the Father's character; exulting in their Father. And so he condescends to call us his "beloved children;" and he says to us in effect: 'Now, be like your Father; I have done this for you; I have forgiven you; there is no charge against you, and there never shall be; all charges against you are blotted out for ever; there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus. You are safe, and you will be safe for ever; for who shall lay anything to your charge? God has justified; and Christ appears in heaven as your intercessor; so, no charge lies against you. But having done all this for you, I want you to be like me. My dear children, not only be glad, and gratified, and delighted that you have such a Father, but try and copy him.'

Now, how delightful a thing it is to hear people say of you, "Why, this man, these men are Christlike; they have Godlike principles about them; they are men to be trusted; they are thorough men: for the Spirit of the Lord has been at work within them; his light shines within them, and shines out of them in consequence. Divine facts have got a lodgment in their souls, and Divine practices are the result, as seen in their every day life. They have been to God's school, as dear children." They have cost him a great deal, if you use the word "dear" in that sense. Oh the

Digitized by Google

price that was paid for them! The Son of God, laid down his life for us. Think of it, my friends; the amazing sacrifice, the astonishing surrender. He gave himself for men. God so loved us as to give his Son. His Son so loved us as to give himself. Otherwise there could have been no virtue in the gift. If the Redeemer's death had been forced upon him, our redemption thereby would have been impossible.

But do you not see where this logically leads you? It leads to this: that that Being was more than mere man; that he was no ordinary man. It would be sinful in any one of us to give ourselves up to die, for our lives are not our own. The Lord Jesus Christ, on the contrary, gave himself up; and therefore the Father hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name, that *in* the name of Jesus – for that is the word—all worship should be rendered to God. See how the Father has honoured the self-surrender of Christ by making him the medium of homage to the Eternal Throne for ever; and see how he hath rewarded him by making all who thus come to him his "beloved children," in Christ.

We believers are his "dear children," not only because of the price he has paid, the redemption-price by which we have been purchased, brought back, saved, emancipated, redeemed from captivity; but he has given to us his Holy Spirit. The Holy Ghost, you will remember, came down on the day of Pentecost; and the disciples were then baptized for their great work and mission, baptized into the Body of Christ, which is the work of the Holy Spirit; and that Spirit has been continued in the Church, the Body of Christ. There are, no doubt, numbers of persons who are professing Christians, who have not the Spirit of Christ. I know it is so; but I say that every member of the Church, truly so-called, has the Spirit of Christ. You cannot be a member of the Church except you have the Spirit of Christ; for "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." He may call himself a saint, but he is only so in name.

Our God has given us his Holy Spirit; and thus he has proved that we are his "beloved children," his "dear children." And the fruits of the Spirit are produced in all those whom he thus adopts into his family. All that is the mere doctrine of the matter; but this is its practice: "Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." "Be ye therefore followers," copiers, imitators of God. In the case supposed, of a brother offending, forgive him. In the case of a brother doing or saying anything which hurts another, he is to be forgiven. "Be kind to one another, tender-hearted," for that is the spring of kindness; and kindness is but a modification of love; and kindness of action springs from tenderness of heart. If this be so, then we are copying God, imitating him, and doing what he does. His tender heart forgave all our

Digitized by Google

sins and transgressions; and he says to us: "Now, just copy me; that is all you have to do; do as I have done."

We ought to consider that we are members one of another; and if one member suffers, all the members suffer, and that if one member be honoured, all are honoured. If Christians would thus imitate the Divine Father, in Christ, what a commentary it would be on the truth of Christianity! We write many books about the evidences of Christianity and the truth of revealed religion. But if Christians would but imitate their Heavenly Father, we should not need such books. The best kind of book on the evidences of Christianity is the living book. Let every man see and read those epistles, which, says the Apostle Paul, are written in our hearts. But who can read our hearts? you say.

Well, you are manifestly declared to be the epistles of Christ, written not with pen and ink, but by the Spirit of the Living God. It is in the heart, and it comes out in the life. You see that that man or that woman has been with Christ; you see they are Christians, Christ-like, gentle, loving, kind, firm as a rock where principle is concerned, and gentle as a summer zephyr where conduct is exhibited. Nay, the very kindness of the genuine Christian springs from the firmness of the principles of Christianity which he has in his heart. He gives place to subjection, no, not for an hour where error exists. Why? That the liberty of the gospel may remain; that kindness of heart may be cultivated; that "Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith;" that "ye might be filled with all the fulness of God."

And so the Apostle acknowledges the kindness of the Ephesians to him, and in effect says: 'I feel your kindness exceedingly. It was love to Christ that led you to love me thus. But I am quite prepared to die for the name of Jesus.' These things he says with the same breath. Well now, let us get a man of this kind. You need not talk to him about honesty, or integrity, or the little virtues of a mere morality. Trust the man who is alive to God in Christ Jesus. You need not continually spy, or dodge his steps, to see how he behaves himself. He is a son of God, his dear child; and as such he will pass through life bearing its burdens bravely, and discharging its duties zealously, and all the time feeling that he is nothing whatever except for the great and glorious fact that he is "accepted in the Beloved," the child of God in Christ.

Now, there is another point. It is supposed in these words that the eye of the world is looking on. "Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children." Walk in love. People will see. You will thereby be witnesses for God. Walk in the ways of God. Follow God. Imitate God. That is simply a modification of what is said already. You will be "living epistles, known and read of all men." What I wish to say more on that subject is, that it is an exceedingly easy thing to be a Christian. Yes, if you are a child of God it is easy to imitate him; the genuine Christian has no difficulty whatever about it.

Digitized by Google

It is the hypocrite who has all the difficulty. It is the pretender that cannot succeed. The child who knows its own home loves its father and its mother, and walks in love. It is when you are tempted to put on Christianity without Christ in the heart, that you encounter the difficulty. I am such an ardent lover of liberty that I would not be a hypocrite for all the world. To put on a mask, pretending that you are a Christian when you know you are not, that is unendurable, that is despicable. So, therefore, contrary to the advice about the small moralities, I say: "*Be Christians*, and then you will have all these lovely things, these graces, these fruits, coming out in life, and you will find it easy." But it is *not easy* to put on Christianity if it is not in the heart.

But when in Christ, it is easy for us to go to the Throne of Grace with a smile on the face, to speak to our Heavenly Father, and to lift up the voice of song and praise from hearts filled with thankfulness, and to produce the fruits of righteousness, which are to the glory of God by Jesus Christ. You are then in the garden; and the fruits of the garden are borne by you, and God is glorified. "Be ye therefore followers of God," as children beloved. Walk in love. He who walks in the love of Christ will not go far wrong in the doctrines of Christ. As a man is in his heart, so he will be in his life and conduct. You have now had a glance of the doctrine and precept of those sweet little verses. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God our Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all. Amen.

THE FLOWER TEXT.

"Consider the lilies of the field."—MATT. vi. 28.

A TEXT of beauty from the lips of grace!
This loving word my fainting faith shall brace;
And when I feel that fear and doubt have power,
I'll think with thankfulness upon a flower.

God formed the lily, gave it sun and dew,
And made it pure and graceful to the view;
A living thing, whose floral life contains
A lesson for mankind, which Christ explains.

A lovely thing, by bounteous heaven arrayed
In finer robes than Solomon displayed:
Incarnate Wisdom sees the Maker's hand
In smallest matters, as in objects grand.

That is the wise philosophy and true,
That ever keeps the hand of God in view:
Christ, the divine philosopher, is "Light;"
To think with him must be to think aright.

Digitized by Google

THOUGHTS ON CHRISTIAN WORK, AND OUR CHRISTIAN CONDITION.

LETTER II.—*The Obligations of Believers,—Are we Christians?*

THIS question,—a startling one certainly,—has recently been put, in all seriousness, by one * who thinks it unreasonable that he should be blamed for rejecting a volume, the *distinguishing* moral features of which Christians do not themselves believe in. He bids us say plainly whether we retain or reject what may be called the ascetic element in the Bible? by which he tells us he means, "All the beliefs that gather round the doctrine that man's duty here is not to make the best of this world, but to prepare himself for another."

We are accused of "compromising the matter by retaining a *verbal belief* in doctrines which have been emptied of their old meaning," and by "converting what was once a disturbing force into a force identical in its direction with those of earthly origin, although more elevating in its character."

The criticism, whatever may be its worth,—and it is not for me to decide on its precise value,—interprets to a considerable extent what is meant when it is affirmed that "popular Evangelical teaching, judging it by its fruits, does not produce a *Christ-like* character; and it will be seen that *the test* is our interpretation of, and our obedience or non-obedience to, the doctrines inculcated in the Sermon on the Mount.

And here it may be well to notice that *ordinary beliefs* relating to our Lord's wonderful discourse have recently been expressed, if not by authority, by eminent clergymen of the Church of England. The Dean of St. Paul's, observing the state of Christian Society, has recently remarked, "Here is the New Testament, the confessed source of Christian morality, with its facts and language, about which there is no dispute, and with its spirit and tone equally distinct and marked. And, on the other hand, here is the ordinary life of Christian Society, with its accepted principles, its familiar habits, its long-sanctioned traditions; the life of Christian Society, not particularly of this or that age, but as, on the whole, it has been since the time when Christianity won its place definitely in the world. When we put the two side by side, the mind must be dull, indeed, which is not conscious of a strong sense of difference and *contrast*. The change is not only one of fact, but in the general sense of what is right and lawful in the general view of the conduct of life." This is a striking admission. Yet the Preacher justifies Society, observing, "In all directions we see instances of the necessity of things enforcing an enlarged interpretation of language, and we believe that the common sense and instinct of

* Mr. Leslie Stephen.

Digitized by Google

Christians have (in relation to the Sermon on the Mount) caught its true meaning."

Such being the avowed sentiments, not of the Dean alone, but of others who like him love and preach the Gospel, what reply have we to give to the accusations of the sceptic? How shall we ascertain whether or no this *apparent* divergence is, or is not, a real one?

Nobody, of course, maintains that a slavish adherence to *the literal words* is required of us? "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," is as true in relation to precepts as to statements of doctrine, and would not be the less true if it could be *demonstrated* —which it certainly cannot—that we have in Scripture the exact language of the Master.

It is with the *spirit* of Christ's commands that we have to do, and the question with us should not be, "Are we obeying *literally*," but "Are we obeying *really?*" Are we accepting, without evasion, the mind of Christ? Are we living *above* the world and its maxims, to an extent that makes our standard of right and wrong obviously different, and perceptibly higher than that which satisfies men in general? I say obviously and perceptibly, because if the difference in question cannot be recognised by unspiritual men, it is of no value, either as an illustration of what true Christianity is, or as an example to them.

A more important inquiry cannot therefore, in my opinion, be entered upon than this,—"What does Christ really expect of His people in relation to precepts which Christians generally now feel justified in diluting to an indefinite extent in order to meet the supposed necessities of Society? A portion, at least, of the energy now devoted to Christian work could not, I think, be better employed than in considering whether or no there may not be some serious defect in our Christianity which hinders its success."

In pursuing such an investigation, the first thing that strikes one is *the utter impossibility* of laying down *any fixed and definite rule*, conformity to which should be regarded as essential to obedience. Had this been either practicable or desirable, Christ himself would have done it. All his teachings relative to conduct would then have taken the form of *rules* rather than of principles; of principles to be applied, not indeed altogether at the discretion of those to whom they are given, but under the guidance of spiritual wisdom.

Why He has chosen to lay down principles rather than rules is obvious. RULES, hard and unyielding, would have been sure to engender fanaticism, and the result, as has been exemplified by ascetics in all ages, would have been pride, formalism, and an unloving character generally. PRINCIPLES, on the contrary, although often difficult of application, require, if they are to be influential, much forethought; a deep and continued study of Scripture; a thorough acquaintance with its spirit as a whole; and a congenial

Digitized by Google

temper of mind, manifested in humility, candour, and charitableness, since in proportion as such virtues are cherished will truth be arrived at.

But it will not, in every case, be *the same truth* to every individual. It will be *that form of truth* to each separate inquirer which may be best adapted to his or her spiritual advancement. It is this diversity of result which exhibits and explains the practical difference between rules and principles. Rules for a man's guidance are necessarily definite, unchanging, and altogether independent of the moral state of the person on whom they are imposed. Principles, on the other hand, require both for their discernment and application a right subjective condition in those to whom they are given.

Now the Bible, and emphatically the New Testament, is distinguished from all other books by the circumstance that it is at once clear and dark, and profitable even when obscure, since it is, from first to last, a book of principles, to be pondered rather than hastily read. Hence the peculiarity of its structure, so different from what mankind might have expected, and would have preferred. Hence the diversity of men's opinions as to its contents, a diversity which, so far as we can see, will always exist among men who equally desire to obey its injunctions. Hence the existence of commands in it which, although binding on individuals who profess to live for another and a better world, are not so on persons who live only for the outward and visible. Hence what are called *Christian Nations* are not, as such, addressed in the New Testament, and are not expected to act on principles which are, nevertheless, absolutely obligatory on individuals. Hence, too, the doubts and difficulties which beset so many; and hence the absence of a God-given and infallible interpreter, notwithstanding the presence of much in the book that is difficult to understand.

In all these particulars, however, the Divine Wisdom is seen. In all *the object* of the revelation is steadily kept in view, viz., to form a special order of character, and, by Divine co-operation with the renewed human will, to perfect "the man of God," and to fit him for "every good word and work," calling upon him to "*work out his own* salvation" (his deliverance from the power of evil) "with fear and trembling" (with modest diffidence), because it is God that worketh in him, both "to will and to do of His own good pleasure."

It is this unique characteristic —"spirit speaking only to spirit" —which justifies the observation that Scripture, to borrow the striking words of the Master of Baliol, stands alone. "Other writings," he says, "merely ask for the comprehension of their statements, the exercise of a clear logical faculty; these, meditating between two worlds, the visible and the invisible, often seem to indicate much that can be powerfully felt in the heart, although scarcely, if at all, capable of being translated into words, and

Digitized by Google

demand *sympathy*, as an essential condition to the right understanding of passages, beyond the power of philosophy to analyse, yet full of meaning *to him who catches the accent*."

But what follows if this be true? Clearly the perception that the interpreting of Scripture—so far at least as its teachings bear upon our personal conduct,—is a most important part of our *individual* responsibility, that it is one of the chief elements of our probation; that, therefore, in this particular the pulpit, however useful in other respects, may hinder, but cannot help us; that commentaries, however sound and good, cannot, for the same reason, do more than perplex us; that nothing, in short, but a prolonged, habitual, painstaking, and personal study of the Word of God, accompanied by meditation thereupon, by prayer for guidance, and by the application of every faculty of the mind to its perusal, will enable each man for himself to perceive what is required *of him*, if he is to make "his calling and election" to rank and high service in the world to come "*sure*," and, at the same time, help him to discover how far *he in particular* is required, without judging others, to set at defiance the opinions and practices of the Christian, as well as of the irreligious world, by following a line of conduct, distasteful, it may be, to loved and honoured friends, because practically condemning their own course.

I say, in these things preachers and commentaries may hinder, but cannot help us, not because I despise either the one or the other, but because both are necessarily obliged to ignore individuality; since they cannot take cognisance of that subtle, but all-controlling influence of the Holy Spirit, which is so often distinctly *personal* in operation, and which, as spirit dealing only with spirit, makes clear to a man a path which no fellow-mortal can point out to him as peculiarly *his*.

The moment a preacher undertakes to expound a Divine principle, he necessarily exchanges—however unconsciously and unintentionally it may be done—the heavenly principle for a rule of earthly conduct, and in so doing adapts his exhortation to *the many*, but endangers the Divine message to the individual who accepts his interpretation of it, as if it were the voice of God *to him*. It is this inevitable result of preaching in the present day which—in consequence of its universality, and its so commonly taking the place of private study—tends to make it an occasion of hindrance rather than a help to Christians, *so far as growth is concerned*.

It is not, indeed, easy to believe, says Dr. Mozley, from whose sermons I have already quoted, that something "morally as well as intellectually defective" is not indicated whenever any one man "gives himself up to be moulded by another," since individuality "pre-eminently constitutes the man," and "the preservation of it is the best security we can have for the continuance of what is most precious and sterling in character."

Hence it is that I have attached, what some will think an ex-

Digitized by Google

aggerated value to the *individual* study of Scripture; and hence, too, it is—to revert once more to the Sermon on the Mount—that I am satisfied the true meaning of our Lord's words can only be arrived at, by each individual Christian interpreting them for himself in the light of conscience, illumined by the Spirit of God.

If this were commonly done, I am satisfied that a considerable change would speedily take place in the general view Christians would take of that marvellous discourse; that it would soon become plain enough to them that, without falling into extravagance, a much nearer approach might be made to what is required, than we have as yet endeavoured after; that a far greater amount of disinterestedness might be exercised by most of us with advantage; that our desire for gain is much too inordinate, and our efforts to do good to others too spasmodic and excited. At the same time one can scarcely doubt that, since the unselfishness, the meekness, the charity, and the humility required of the followers of the Redeemer, can never be rightly understood by persons whose characters have little or no affinity to that of Christ, it will be found impossible, fully and fairly, to act out what He has commanded, without incurring the contempt of a multitude who profess and call themselves Christians. These are, I feel sure, the conclusions to which we should inevitably be brought if we lived in the atmosphere of Heaven; if the Scriptures were not only read, but carefully and habitually searched; if we imbibed their spirit, and interpreted the precepts of the Lord by His own example.

But this independent study of Scripture for personal guidance is just the one thing Christians of the present day will not do. They say they cannot. They fancy they have neither time nor ability to investigate for themselves. They imagine God has set apart an order of men to interpret His will for them, to supply their want of power, to meet their weakness, and so to keep them in the right path. That the Bible should be read by them both privately and in their families for *devotional purposes* they do not dispute, but anything beyond this is, they insist, simply impossible.

And yet many of these very persons find time enough for Christian work, and pursue it as if regard for the best interests of others might lawfully take the place of personal endeavours after Christian Perfection; as if Spiritual Culture might be dispensed with as a superfluity; as if it were a greater and better thing to *proclaim* the Gospel, than to spend time in seeking after the Christian knowledge, and the "Power from on High," without which it is impossible *in the highest sense* to *live;* as if anything but loss could accrue from neglecting, if not decrying, the *educational* character of Revelation, by separating its parts, and narrowing its scope.

* Henry Dunn.

Digitized by Google

THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.*

"Because I will publish the name of the Lord: ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he."—DEUT. xxxii. 3, 4.

"As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord."—NUM. xiv. 21.

HE who believes that the Creator and Ruler of the universe is infinitely wise, good, and powerful, must also believe that the evil which exists had a beginning and will have an end. It can neither be eternal in origin nor duration; for that would make it in these respects equal with God, which is impossible and absurd. But that evil exists under the government of the infinitely wise, good, and powerful Ruler is beyond question; and that it exists in numberless forms, physical, moral, mental, domestic, social, and national, and is constantly producing most mournful effects, no one can possibly deny. All the agencies set in motion by religion, benevolence, and philanthropy to repress in some degree its action, and alleviate its consequences, prove this.

And here we recognise one of the signal services which it renders to society. It draws forth sympathy, pity, compassion, enlisting in the war against itself the best and purest and most unselfish feelings of which the human heart is capable. Good men become followers—"imitators"—of God, when they devote their time, energies, or substance to the work of checking the career if they cannot dry up the springs of evil. It is blessed thus to give; the benefactor becomes a beneficiary; he gets back in the form of health and joy to his own heart the health and joy he tries to impart to the wounded heart of another. Amidst his deep sufferings, memory brings a ray of consolation to Job:

> When the ear heard me, then it blessed me;
> And when the eye saw me, then it witnessed for me;
> Because I delivered the poor that cried,
> The orphan, and him that had no helper.
> The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me,
> And I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.
> I put on righteousness, and it clothed me,
> My rectitude was to me for mantle and turban.
> I was eyes to the blind,
> And feet was I to the lame.
> I was a father to the indigent,
> And the cause which I understood not I searched out.
> And I broke the jaws of the wicked,
> And plucked the spoil from his teeth.

---

* This paper appeared in the RAINBOW in January, 1875. As it has been *repeatedly asked for*, it is republished in the hope that it may be useful. A gentleman in Toronto has printed 2,000 copies of it, as he thinks it calculated to meet a common objection to revealed truth. May a blessing attend it!—ED.

Digitized by Google

Such beams of joy gladden many hearts every day. To feel that some trouble has been lightened, that some sorrow has been robbed of its intensity, or that some great difficulty in a poor brother's path has been removed *by you*, is, *to you*, an instantaneous pleasure and more than an adequate reward. Christ-like work, done "for Christ's sake," never loses its "wages." We speak not now of the grand prizes which the Master intends for his imitators in the day that is about to dawn, but of the present consciousness of pleasure and gratitude that accompanies self-sacrificing deeds.

Now, it is perfectly obvious that if there were no evil in the world the inexpressibly precious education in the Christ-like character which his followers thus acquire would be impossible. But the ministry of evil is actually an appeal—by sin and sorrow and tears and woe—to the ministry of good; and the response to that appeal is just the goodness of God acting through his children; whilst they themselves, as his sympathetic almoners, become more like their holy and blessed Father.

The preceptive portions of the Bible are copiously rich on this subject. It is generally taken for granted, and sometimes plainly stated, that there are two antagonistic moral forces in the world; and the counsels which God gives to those who are willing to obey him relate to this fact. For example,—and a very few examples will suffice in a case so obvious,—"Remember them that are in bonds as bound with them, and them who suffer adversity as being yourselves also in the body. Bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

Besides, what does our blessed Lord mean by calling his followers "light" if there is not darkness, and "salt" if there is not corruption? Observe, the argument here is not that the darkness and corruption are denied, for no one denies them; but that they belong to that ministry of evil which gives occasion to the counteracting ministry of good on the part of Christ's followers, who themselves receive benefit, as has been already said, whilst trying to benefit others.

Again, the corrective ministry of evil, under the blessing of God, is a recognised fact in the moral world. "Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now have I kept thy word. It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes. I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus: Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke; turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God. Surely after that I was turned I repented; and after that I was instructed I smote upon my thigh. I was ashamed, yea, even con-

Digitized by Google

founded, because I did bear the reproach of my youth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh who corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure,"—i.e., administered discipline as seemed good to them,—"but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

These quotations express the experience of a great multitude. Evil, whether in the form of bodily or mental suffering, has been the means, in countless instances, by which God has brought the sufferer from sin to holiness, from a state of alienation to a state of reconciliation and peace. The parable of the prodigal is one of those wonderfully happy types which our all-wise Lord used for the instruction of humanity during his absence in the heavens. When this representative sinner "came to himself," he resolved to go to his father. Hunger, rags, and misery were the rough ministers that preached to him, "Go home!" Heartaches, disappointments, writhing consciences, and crushing sorrows from a thousand causes, have cried to the sufferers, "Up, go home!" And the world, the flesh, and the devil have mockingly hissed in the ear of their victim, "If you don't like our service, go to your Father!" Happy for that victim when—stung to resolution by his tormentors—he has said, with all the energy of which his enfeebled powers were capable, "I WILL arise and go to my Father!" How the Heavenly Father receives such moral bankrupts when they come to his feet in sorry plight, trembling in an agony of shame on the very border of despair, we need not tell. They know. Ay, *they* know! And they will most assuredly talk about it "in the world to come," as they delight to do now, to the glory of their wonderful Father!

But genuine Christians, the children of God in Christ, as the Scriptures quoted teach, are often greatly benefited by things which are in themselves evil. It is not the Lord's way to change the nature of things; he never does that; evil is evil still, and will remain so until it entirely disappears from the universe, but it *is* his way to make all things work together for the good of his children; and so it is written: "For a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations: that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." And again, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you; but rejoice, inas-

Digitized by Google

much as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." Bereaved hearts, after mourning bitterly, have yearningly turned to God with a deeper and holier love; and the widow has found in him a Husband, and the orphan a Father. The man of wisdom hears the rod and him who appointed it. Accepted discipline deepens loyalty, and fosters graces which in the day of unbroken prosperity generally languish. The pruning process is not agreeable to the flesh; but the Father prunes the branches of the True Vine that they may bring forth more fruit. Not in anger, but in love, he gives his children those moral tonics which, though unpleasant to the taste, are healthful to the system; and as his eye and his heart are fixed upon a period when their perfect health will be confirmed, and their Christ-like beauty secured for ever, and when, therefore, the ministry of evil will be no longer needed, it is at once their duty, their privilege, and their wisdom humbly to accept his way of bringing them up for "glory, honour, and immortality."

"But,"—we imagine some reader asking,—"seeing that God is so good and wise, why did he permit the entrance of evil at all? Could he not have prevented it, and thus have saved the race from the countless sorrows through which it has had to plod its weary way, from the first until now?"

Yes, he could—so far as power is concerned—have prevented the entrance of evil; but in that case his purpose in creation would have been entirely different from what we know it really was. Let us look at this matter with the reverence and thoughtfulness it demands. It *must* be assumed that as the creature, man, is to be dependent on his Creator, some test of his loyalty is absolutely essential to start with. No matter what that test is. Some very simple thing will do; and we know, as a matter of fact, that a very simple thing was selected for this purpose. Now here we come at once upon an insuperable difficulty: the entrance of evil could have been prevented in no possible way that we can think of except by making the man infallible; but a test of loyalty to an infallible being is an utter absurdity. Where is the wisdom of trying a being who cannot be tried, simply because he is created infallible? Why forbid him to do a thing which, in consequence of his natural constitution, he cannot do? He is positively invulnerable, incapable of receiving evil. Evil? Why he could not understand the meaning of the word if it was named in his hearing. And Good? The term is equally unmeaning, so far as this moral virtue is concerned, in the case of a creature who has no choice, no will, and no power of doing or being anything but that which the necessity of his nature imposes. He is a machine, a living machine, to which it is simply an abuse of language to apply any moral action whatever. He cannot sin; therefore he cannot be holy; he is merely innocent, which is negative, whilst holiness is positive and a matter of personal choice: he is incapable of vice; therefore, he has no virtue: he

Digitized by Google

cannot rebel against God; therefore, his loyalty is worthless: he cannot err; therefore, his rectitude is without merit: he cannot feel sickness; therefore, he knows not the meaning of health: he has seen no sorrow; and, therefore, has no sympathy: he cannot commit folly; and, therefore, has no idea of wisdom: he knows nothing of grief; and is, therefore, ignorant of joy: and in one word, though a thousand words more might be used, as he cannot possibly do wrong, in any sense of that word, so it is impossible to give him the slightest credit for doing right, because it is not the action of a voluntary agent but the necessity of an irresponsible machine.

Who would choose to be such a thing as this? And who does not see that, under the overruling government and grace of the Infinitely Wise, the ministry of evil has been of immense and incalculable value to mankind? The education of humanity would have been impossible had the individuals composing the race been of the unattractive type we have imagined,—persons without individual character, of whom it would be simple truth to say, as Jeremiah says of heathen gods, "They cannot do evil, neither also is it in them to do good."

The truth is, this notion of creature infallibility is on the same plane of thought as that of creature immortality. They are both fundamental mistakes which prevent men from seeing the wonderful grandeur of the design which underlies creation, gives redemption its ineffable value, and will by and by crown a perfected universe with unfading glory.* Exemption from liability to err is the exclusive prerogative of God, and cannot be communicated to any creature; that is to say, the two ideas of creaturehood and infallibility are incongruous. WILL—we do not say "*free* will," because if it is not free, it is no longer will—is essential to moral responsibility; hence disobedience is sin, and obedience is holiness. We can understand certain angels choosing to continue steadfast in their allegiance to God, and, as a reward of their loyalty, being confirmed in their pure character and honourable position; and we can understand others choosing to join the standard of revolt and becoming hardened in their hatred of the holiness they lost; but it was the *volition* in either case that gave character to the conduct, and proved that both parties were responsible to the Divine Sovereign. In like manner we can understand man resisting temptation or yielding to it, as the event may prove; but responsibility in connection with infallibility is to us altogether incomprehensible. Had God, therefore, created man invulnerable, and transmitted the gift to the race, the world would indeed have been spared its sorrows; but it would have missed the vast wealth of moral heroism,—of virtue struggling with vice,—of holiness beating back sin in ten thousand battles,—of suffering developing sanctification,—of law

* See a suggestive and admirable paper—"The Agency of Sin"—by General Goodwyn, in the RAINBOW, for August, 1874.

Digitized by Google

perfectly honoured in the person of One bearing the nature of the race, and yet successfully resisting the subtlest temptation,—and of the manifold wisdom and boundless goodness of God in the magnificent work of redemption,—as these have been witnessed during the progress of human history and Divine revelation.

And, as already hinted, we do not see how the education of the race could have been possible under the supposed condition of infallibility. What is the fact? Why, just this; *we are trained by contrasts.* Our very language is formed upon the basis of opposing forces. How could we appreciate pleasure but for pain; joy, but for sorrow; health, but for sickness; happiness, but for misery; pardon, but for guilt; holiness, but for sin? The thoughtful reader sees at once that such questions could be multiplied to any extent. The idea of training by contrasts meets us everywhere. It pervades the natural world, as well as the moral; thus:—cold and heat; winter and summer; storm and calm. And it is found in the intellectual region as well as in the natural and moral; barbarism and civilisation; rudeness and gentleness; ignorance and knowledge; folly and wisdom.

There are persons who frequently speak about "the mystery of evil" as if some irremediable calamity had befallen mankind by its entrance, forgetting, or neglecting to think over, these extremely important facts. They also invariably overstate the condition of the first man previous to his act of disobedience, attributing to him moral and mental qualities which most certainly he had not, for they can only be acquired by the sons of God in the school of Christ, under the influence of the opposing forces,—the education by contrasts,—to which we have alluded. And then, with these crude ideas in mind, they describe the work of our adorable Redeemer *as intended to bring men back to the condition of Adam before his fall.* Surely this is something worse than even the baldest and most meagre representation of theology; it is positive misrepresentation! Those who speak thus know very little about either the first or second Adam, and that little they have not found in the Holy Scriptures. Not the first man who was of the earth earthy, is the model for the sons of God, but the Second Man, who is the Lord from heaven. Not to the condition of Adam, but to oneness with Christ is the believer brought. And not to the innocence of the child-man of Eden, who knew not as yet the meaning of the words good and evil, is the follower of the Saviour conducted, but to the possession of the divine nature, to likeness to Christ, to immortality, to perfection, and to God!

"As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. We all with unveiled face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

Digitized by Google

For our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through" (not "through," ἐν=IN) "Jesus Christ our Lord. Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

But are these sublime privileges to be enjoyed, and these transcendent prospects to be realised, without the ministry of evil? No! Who values safety? The person exposed to danger. Who appreciates life? The criminal condemned to die. Who presses to his heart with unutterable thankfulness the glorious truth of redemption by the blood of Christ? The man who has groaned under the loathsome burden of sin, and felt his utter inability to kill the dragon that was crushing him. "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I THANK GOD THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD." "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." ED.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.*

BEYOND question this is a work of remarkable ability. We by no means say that we are able to agree with the entire view of this able writer. With a very considerable part however of his argument we do go.

* The Priesthood of Christ: A Re-statement of Vital Truth. By Joseph Parker, D.D. London: R. D. Dickinson, Farringdon-street.

Digitized by Google

We hold that all truth, and especially so grand a truth as that of which he treats, is multiform, has many sides, and many aspects. We hold that the various minds of various men, all, we will suppose, under the influence of divine grace and the love of truth, will, nay must, lay especial hold of that aspect of doctrine which commends itself most to their peculiar mental organisation and their own most pressing wants: and that thus even one mind may, at different periods of its spiritual experience, dwell more upon one aspect of truth than on another; or, to use Dr. Parker's words, "that in the same soul there may be such variations of mood and temperature as to require, in the course of a lifetime, every possible aspect in which the infinitely various ministry of Jesus Christ can be set." (177.) Perhaps the history of one earnest mind, variously assailed by trial, turning to every aspect in which Christ our High Priest is placed before us in the Scriptures, might afford the best solution of many of the difficulties which surround this mighty question of which we speak. We would venture to say of the execution of this book that in our opinion it has been written in too many words. In the author's statement, however, in his preface, that while he would not have us regard his book as a volume of sermons, yet that most of it has been in some form delivered from the pulpit, we find the explanation of what appears to us to have too much of repetition.

In two pithy sentences—for Dr. Parker knows as well how to condense as to expand—he lays before us the basis of our entire question. He asks in the setting out of his work—"*What did Jesus Christ do for men that men could not have done for themselves?*" and farther on in his work, he repeats this question in other words—"*Why should men have required a priest?*" Here is indeed the root of this entire matter,—human insufficiency, and Christ supplying the mighty want which none but he could do.

We do not know that a better definition of what is meant by a priest could be given than that which Dr. Parker gives:—"A priest," he tells us, "is one who stands between God and man, because man has in some way disqualified himself for having immediate personal access to God; and not only does the priest stand there, but he is ordained for the express purpose of offering gifts and sacrifices, that is to say, if he had nothing to offer he would not be a priest: while, of the offering which Christ our priest has offered to God on behalf of men, he tells us what it was, and how its idea constitutes the very spirit of prophecy, as predicted in Genesis, typified in the wilderness, foreshadowed in the ritual, sung in the psalms with mingled mournfulness and hope, and declared by Christ Himself to be the laying down of his own life." (144-151.) With such definitions of humanity, of its great priest and his offering, we can scarcely question the fundamental soundness of Dr. Parker's own view of the question of which he ably treats.

But the great difficulty with him is how to find a point of rest for the apparently irreconcilable and opposing theories which men, all of whom he supposes to be actuated by a sincere and honest love of truth, have formed upon this whole subject of expiation and priesthood. In the pursuit of the solution of this difficulty he brings before us in an extremely interesting manner men whom he takes as the representative men of the great conflicting theories.

Digitized by Google

He first brings before us the case of the poet Cowper, the unhappy child of genius and of sorrow. Speaking of the subject Cowper says:—"God is always formidable to me, except when I see Him *disarmed of his sting* by having sheathed it in the body of Jesus Christ." Commenting upon this expression of Cowper, in order to show that such a view of expiation was the only view that could be true to such a mind, but that to such a mind it was the truth, our author tells us, "If you had said to the poet, 'God loves you; He sent his Son Jesus Christ to tell you so, and to lead you home to peace, and rest, and joy,' the poet would have exclaimed: 'This is impossible! this is mockery! You do not know how many and terrible are my sins! You do not see what I see; the avenging spectres, the spirits of wrath and torment that throng the sultry air, are hidden from you,—O God, I dread Thee!' You must meet his case by a tragedy that shall overpower the disease within him; he must be appalled, confounded, affrighted by a spectacle that shall overmatch the horror spread over his mind by the realisation of his own sin, and out of that greater tragedy he may come to derive the benefit appropriate to his peculiar distress." And a little farther on he adds, still speaking of Cowper,—"No other view could have made itself felt *in the then state of his heart*. This was the theology which saved him from the hell of despair." (173, 174.)

We do not dispute that Cowper may be taken as a representative man of what very many would call the orthodox view of the atonement; and yet, with all deference to Dr. Parker, we do not think that Cowper should be brought forward as the representative of those opinions, or that the manner in which Dr. Parker has brought him forward is exactly just. Cowper was a man of diseased mind, for long periods of his life afflicted with positive insanity, gloomy and desponding in the extreme. Moreover Dr. Parker more than hints that in a different state of heart Cowper might have held very different, if not quite opposite views of the atonement from those which he did hold. Under these circumstances we certainly do not hold that Cowper is at all the most suitable representative man that could be selected. We think rather that a man of genial disposition and unruffled reason should have been chosen, and such a choice would have been easy, for such men have been in numbers, happier far than poor Cowper ever was, but substantially agreeing with him in opinion. And then, Cowper's views did not, in his seasons of deep mental alienation, save him from despair. How sadly does he compare the peace which he supposes his mother to have reached in heaven with the despair he felt on earth!

> "But me, scarce hoping to attain the rest,
> Always from port withheld, always distressed—
> The howling blasts drive devious, tempest-tossed,
> Sails ripped, seams opening wide, and compass lost,
> And day by day some current's thwarting force
> Sets me more distant from a prosperous course."

In contrast with minds like Cowper's, and views on theology adapted to such, our author brings forward two different constitutions of temperament which will, he supposes, require a very different aspect of multiform truth to supply their want. We will give his descriptions in his own words. After dismissing the example of Cowper, he proceeds

Digitized by Google

thus :—"Set in opposition to this the case of a man whose constitution and temperament are of an exactly opposite type, and it will be a *psychological impossibility* for that man to accept the view which alone saved the poet from despair. Even if he found Cowper's very words in the New Testament itself they would be a stumbling-block and an offence unto him. . . The man, whom we are supposing for the purposes of this illustration, is thoroughly in earnest, supremely anxious to know and love and serve Christ. His notions of abstract or metaphysical justice are not amongst the principal characteristics of his mind; he is emotional, patient, hopeful, and his fatherliness is very pitiful and long-suffering: rectoral discipline there is next to none in his family; probably he may even felicitate himself upon the fact that he never lifted up the rod upon one of his children, without being able to add the felicitation that none of his children ever deserved it. Such a man coming to the life of Christ will, by no fantastic choice but by the operation of a divine law, appropriate the elements which are most congenial to his own nature, and in doing so will find a theology which never could have been discovered or accepted by such a mind as Cowper's." (175.)

In the passage just quoted, we have Dr. Parker's second representative mind. We will now present to our readers his description of a third such, and then proceed to show where he finds the point of rest and union for them all. "A third example," he tells us, "will be very different. Imagine a man of unusual compass of mind, distinctively critical and by so much tending towards a scepticism that insists upon etymological proof of everything that is submitted for acceptance; a mind that will hold long and severe controversy over the niceties of grammar, and will suspend a faith until it has determined the force of a preposition or the proper arrangement of a disputed punctuation; not a prosaic mind either, but one that will have poetry by itself as poetry, and prose by itself as prose, and will separate as clearly and broadly between fancy and logic, as between flying and walking. Such a mind coming to the New Testament will probably be impressed by the simple and pure *humanity* of Jesus Christ. It will lay hold upon that as something absolutely indisputable, and will wonder that anything beyond humanity in its noblest and sweetest aspect, has ever been found in his illustrious and holy character. Such a mind as I am supposing is solemnised and ruled by a most rigid reverence: it could almost worship the sunrise, and is only saved from doing so because reverence is due to One alone, and that is God. To such a mind Jesus Christ is as a sunrise, a beauteous and pathetic revelation, a light that will warm into noonday and broaden into summer, but still only the largest of the orbs itself enkindled by a higher flame. Such a mind will love Christ, and follow him, and call him Lord and Master, and see nothing but excellence in his gracious and tender life. There it will stop." (176.) With such a type of mind Dr. Parker associates the well-known names of William Ellery Channing and James Martineau.

Now how does Dr. Parker find the point of rest for views so various, and as many would say so contradictory to one another, as those of Watts and Heber and Cowper, and Payne, and Channing, and Martineau? "The common point of rest," he tells us," "is a *Fact*, not a

Digitized by Google

Theory; it is a *History*, not a *Speculation.*" "To theorise," he adds, "is to separate. It is evident, therefore, that we are to be saved by a Fact and not by a Speculation; by Christ, and not by any theological construction of his work." "It is not the doctrine of the death of Christ that atones for human sin, but the death itself; it has such a wonderful power, that it inspires faith in God, and purifies the heart, though the doctrine of the atonement be unknown or denied. The power of the great sacrifice for the sins of the world lies in itself, and not in our explanations of it. Even when the doctrine of the Church has been most corrupt, the death of Christ has continued to appeal to the hearts of men with unique and all but irresistible force." (Congregational Union Lecture.) "In a sense never to be explained Christ was an 'unspeakable gift;' a gift for which there are no words, no theories, no creeds, good enough,—his work is a power to be felt in the heart, not to be measured out in words; subtle as a dream, mighty as a law, *anonymous*, infinite, unspeakable." (181.)

If we understand Dr. Parker aright, we would say that his view is that the various views taken upon this great question are in themselves true but do not embrace all the truth. It might to some appear, from the quotations we have given, that our author almost supposed that there was no such thing as absolute truth, but that truth was simply the aspect in which different minds regarded any specific statement of Scripture. Such is, however, not his view, as we understand him. Reviewing the various theories, allowing that each has its aspect of truth, he concludes that if a certain amount of an expression derived rather from heathen than Scriptural sources be excluded from our definitions of the "Expiatory Theory" of the Atonement, there is in that theory "a strength, a moral completeness and grandeur, *a foundation*, not to be had in any other theory of the work of Christ." (262.)

HENRY CONSTABLE.

TRUTH THROUGH REVELATION.

"By revelation he made known unto me the mystery."—EPH. iii. 3.

GREAT are thy gifts, O God,
In providence to man;
But greater still the love that told
Redemption's wondrous plan.

With thee the purpose lay,
The secret of thy heart,
Until the time decreed arrived
That secret to impart.

The ages as they roll,
Are all thy servants, Lord;
Thy will selects the hour to speak
To men thy gracious word.

Digitized by Google

Thy power and glory great,
Sun, moon, and stars proclaim;
Whilst earth, in all its regions, adds
Its tribute to thy fame.

But yet, without the word
By inspiration given,
The wisest men could not have known
The secret will of Heaven.

Now at thy feet, our God,
We lay the grateful heart;
For thou thyself, in love supreme,
Hast told us what thou art!

THE THRONE AND THE WITNESSES.

IN consequence of pre-occupied space last month, we were unable to say all that we wished respecting General Goodwyn's remarkable book.* We again call attention to the work which this devoted servant of the Lord has laid at his Master's feet,—see the touching Preface,—and we do so, not in our own words, but by two very valuable passages from the volume, the first on the "Throne of the Millennial Kingdom," and the second on the "Two Witnesses."

THE THRONE OF THE MILLENNIAL KINGDOM.

IN most of the commentaries that I have met with the Authors have contributed to the opinion that chap. iii. concludes the Revelation of Jesus Christ by His servant John to the Seven Churches, that it is the close of the prophetic history concerning the Church. The consequence has been that chap. iv. has, not without difficulty, been adapted to fill a void and to have little affinity for either the Seven Churches that precede or with the Seven Seals that follow it. This is greatly owing to the mistaken view that has been taken of the events recorded under the symbols. (Chap. 2.)

2. The voice that spoke the words, "Come up hither, and I will show thee things that must be hereafter" (ver. 1), was that of the Lord Jesus, the same "voice as of a trumpet" of Rev. i. 10. After having *heard* the seven epistles dictated to him with the command to "write," the Seer is called up to *see* the "Throne that was set in Heaven." It is not, as some have assumed, that the words "after this" mean a dividing interval, or "after a certain time," but are to be regarded as intimating the vision of chap. iv. to be *in direct succession* to chap. iii. It is not to be supposed that John, in order to write down the epistles at once, lapsed back in the interval to his ordinary consciousness—which

---

* The Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ, elucidated on the principle of permitting the prominent symbols to become the exponents of the events and phenomena with which they are associated. By General H. Goodwyn. London: Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row.

Digitized by Google

must have been the case if the above assumption is entertained—for the seeing and hearing of ver. 1, chap. iv. declare him still to be "in the Spirit" as before. The same Spirit who elevated the Seer to see, gave him the power of remembering what he saw in order to write down all after the conclusion of the series. (Rev. xxii. 8.) Moreover, in order to harmonise the visions of this Book with the entire canon of Scripture in relation to the eternal purpose of God, Rev. iv. must be considered in strict sequence to chap. iii. 21, revealing the character of the Throne, on which the entire body of Overcomers, members of Christ,* are promised their seats. This Throne therefore, in its position in our Book, is as much presented *to the present faith* of the children of God as the revelation of their approaching translation into the firmament to meet the Lord.† It is, in other words, the announcement of *the fact* that God's adopted sons in Christ are NOW "blessed with all spiritual blessings *in Heaven* in Him, raised together with Him, *and (are now) seated together with Him* in the Heavens." "Those whom God has justified He *has* glorified" according to His eternal purpose in Christ,‡ now made known by His Apostles. There can be little question but that the Seer John was in the same circumstances as Paul the Apostle is recorded to have been in 2 Cor. xii., to whom in the third heaven must have been shown the glorified Christ and His Body, a vision that alone could have enabled him to chronicle the Mystery of Ephes. i. 3; ii. 6, and iii., though the fulness of the glory "it was not possible to utter." Paul's glad tidings of salvation were "received by the *Revelation* (*Apocalypse*) *of Jesus Christ*."§

3. The words of the promise in Rev. iii. 21 are very precise. "I will grant to sit with Me on MY THRONE;" and as distinguished from His Father's Throne, on which He now sits. His Throne therefore is immediately presented, and, from the description of its Occupant and surroundings, we perceive how faithfully *all* the promises concerning the future glory of the Body of Christ are fulfilled. The Throne of course takes its character from the offices and dignities of Him whose it is. The official title by which the Lord Jesus Christ is more particularly known in this Book is that of Judge in connection with his sovereignty over creation. Moreover, He is Creator. The Throne is therefore seen about to be "established in righteousness and judgment," when "He shall have dominion over all people, nations, and languages," when "all kings shall bow down before Him."‖ *The power* of this Throne is not yet wielded, for the times of the Gentiles are not yet fulfilled, and this is an age of long-suffering Grace. Creation is stated to be in a condition of affliction and oppression now, whose groans bear witness to the corrupt administration of human governments, though retribution lingers till "the manifestation of the sons of God" on the Throne of the Creator and Judge of all the earth.¶

4. The Lord Jesus is now seated on His Father's Throne, whence He dispenses Grace and mercy, for He is the Mercy-seat thereof;** but, when all that shall have "done iniquity" during the period of the

---

* Cor. xii. 12.
‡ Ephes. i. 3, 4; ii. 6, 7; Rom viii. 30.
‖ Psa. xcvii. 2; lxxii. 8-11; Dan. vii. 14.
** Heb. iv. 14-16.
† 1 Thess. iv. 14-18.
§ Gal. i. 12; Ephes. iii. 3.
¶ Rom. viii. 18-23.

Digitized by Google

world's great apostasy shall be "purged out" by the bowls of wrath and the Advent in glory and power of the "King of kings and the Lord of lords," then this Throne of the Kingdom shall be established, and the "four-and-twenty thrones," of ver. 4, Rev. iv. will be set up "round about" the Central Seat, and "judgment shall be given" to the Elders who shall sit upon them,* and the promise to the Overcomers of Thyatira and Laodicea shall be performed.

5. There are *Seven* features of the Millennial Throne, declaring its perfection as instrumental in the execution of the governmental ways of God on earth. (1.) The Person whom John saw sitting on the Throne needed not to be mentioned; it was ONE whose glory is alluded to as that of Light capable of being endured by the creature; hence the mention of "a jasper and sardine stone," the former of which is mentioned in Rev. xxi. 11, and both adorned the breastplate of Israel's High Priest.† He is nevertheless "the Express Image of God, and the brightness of His glory, whose Throne is for ever and the Sceptre of His Kingdom a Sceptre of Righteousness."‡

2. The Throne is encircled by the Rainbow, the token of God's covenant with the earth. No longer however "the bow in the cloud" (Gen. ix. 13), with its prismatic colours, thrown on to a background of darkness, but green only, "like unto an emerald," reflecting the beautiful verdure of earth that will have been purged by the storms of Judgment; for the Throne belongs to the Day of the Lord on which the Sun of Righteousness will shine, "when the earth shall yield her fulness," "the field shall be joyful and *all* that is therein, and the trees of the wood shall rejoice;" when "instead of the thorn shall come up the firtree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree,"§ eternal evergreens, a praise to Him who shall sit upon the Throne.

3. Round about the Throne were four-and-twenty other Thrones—not seats, as crowned heads are upon them. Much uncertainty has been shown regarding these Elders; but the Scripture itself will supply their meaning, for, as we are now on Israelitish ground in immediate connection with the restoration of the Kingdom of David (Rev. iii. 7), in *the Day of the Lord*, Old Testament symbols and events are throughout the Book employed to give purpose to the phenomena recorded. So let Exodus xviii. 21-27 with Numbers xi. 16, 17 be consulted, where Moses the delegated Ruler of Israel is seen, by Divine appointment, to be assisted in the onerous duties of *judicial* administration by certain "Elders," who with himself were endowed with the Spirit of Jehovah for that purpose. See also Deut. xxvii. 1, where Moses and the Elders are in *joint* action. Again, in order to show that these Elders of our chapter are representatives of a *perfected priestly body*, the number "Twenty-four" is used, being the number of the twenty-four courses of the Priesthood established by David the King‖ for the affairs of the Kingdom. These "Elders," then, "clothed in white raiment, and on their heads crowns of gold," can scarcely be any other than those who, having been "washed from their sins in the blood" of Christ have been "made Kings and Priests unto God," as declared in Rev. i. 6. They

---

* Rev. xx. 4. † Exod. xxvii. 17, 20. ‡ Heb. i. 3, 8.
§ Psa. xcvi. 12; lxvii. 4-7; Isa. lv. 13. ‖ 1 Chron. xxiv.

Digitized by Google

are the Priestly Body of Christ, Saints in their symbolic raiment of Righteousness (Rev. iii. 5; xix. 8); crowned Kings foreseen in their joint possession of the Throne of the Lord (Rev. iii. 21), and fore-prepared for the joint exercise of their judicial functions.*

(4.) Lightnings, Thundering, and Voices are Sinaitic symbols that display the purpose of God in judicial action against the despisers of His Law. This Law will again be in activity during the Day of the Lord, for long-suffering of rebellion and despite done to the Majesty of the Throne of the Lord will interfere with the maintenance of Peace, and cannot be tolerated. "Out of Zion shall go forth *the Law*, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem."† Psa. ii.; cxlix. 6-9; Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix; and Rev. xx. 7-9, are awful instances of this Truth.

(5.) "Seven Lamps of fire burning before the Throne, which are the Seven Spirits of God." In the opening chapter of this Book "Grace" is sent to the churches from "the Seven Spirits of God," perfected Grace. This was in harmony with the existence of a testimony of Grace by the Church. Here, however, Church testimony is passed, and "Lamps of fire" disclose the office and action of the Holy Spirit in the searching exposure of subsequent evil and lawlessness in the Kingdom, which must surely be visited by the Judgment of the Throne, as the fourth feature has just proved.

A comparison of Rev. v. 6 with Zech. iv. 6-10 will reveal another, though similar action of the Seven Spirits of God from the Throne—"*they are the eyes of the Lord* (Rev. i. 14) *that run to and fro through the whole earth*" in order to the establishment of the glory of the Lord's House in Zion, and the fulfilment of the ministry of Israel to the nations.

(6.) It has been supposed that "the sea of glass like unto crystal" of ver. 6 is an allusion to the "molten sea" made by Solomon for the Temple; but the water in that "sea," like that in the laver of the Tabernacle, signified "the washing of water by the Word," an indispensable cleanliness declared necessary for the Priests preparatory to their ministry in the holy place.‡ That Word could never be crystallised into immobility, for it is ever a Word of life, "quick" and active in power. I would rather apply it in contrast with the Ocean Sea, which in its present turbulent and restless state is used in Scripture to signify the unsettled condition of nations, ever clashing one with another in ceaseless discord, scarcely to be quenched without war and its attendant horrors.§ But, before this Throne shall have finished its work, all that will have ceased. Jesus Christ "must reign *till* He has put all enemies under his feet." (1 Cor. xv. 25.) The thunderings, lightnings, and voices will have crushed all defiance of authority, weapons of war will be converted into implements of agriculture,‖ and peace will be preserved. The once boisterous sea will have become smooth and motionless "like unto crystal." "In His days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of Peace so long as the moon

* 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; Dan. vii. 22. † Isa. ii. 3, 4.

‡ For the spiritual significance of the wonderfully mysterious vessels of the Tabernacle, as of the entire Structure, and symbolic vestments of the Priesthood, see the Author's work "Antitypical Parallels." Part III. chap. i. pp. 147-224.

§ Isa. lvii. 20; Jer. vi. 23; Ezek. xxvi. 3. ‖ Isa. ii. 4.

Digitized by Google

endureth. All men shall be blessed in Him and *all nations* shall call Him blessed."*

(7.) "In the midst and round about the Throne were four living creatures" (*zoa*), not "beasts"—the lion, the representative head of wild beasts; the calf (ox), of the domestic animals; the eagle, of the birds; and man, the head of the intelligent Creation. Thus the entire Creation is represented. But it is this Creation that an Apostle informs us is now writhing under the oppression of the evil administration of man. It is "travailing in pain." Nevertheless, in that it "travaileth," the hour of deliverance is at hand; for it has been subjected to the consequences of sin "in hope."† There was fore-declared mercy for Creation in the very position assigned to the Cherubim on the Mercy-seat of the Ark of Israel (Exod. xxv. 18, 19); this mercy in deliverance *is* here expressed by four Living Creatures in the midst and round about the Throne, a Throne that guarantees "the restitution of all things" from the original curse, owing to "THE PRESENCE of the Lord."‡

It must be evident that these "Living Creatures" are identical with the Cherubim of Ezekiel i. 10, which, as just stated, were supporters of the Throne of Israel as long as the Ark—the symbol of the Throne of Jehovah in their midst—dwelt in the Temple. But, when the glory of the Presence of God in the Person of His Son was extinguished on earth at Calvary, it retired to the Heavens, only to return when the Son of God and of David shall occupy the Throne, and the Temple yet to be built shall throw its rays over the whole Millennial earth.§ Ezekiel saw the glory depart from Israel, borne aloft by the cherubic representatives of living creatures of earth (chap. x. 4, 18, 19). He saw also the vision of its return to the House of the Lord, which he says shall be "the place of the Throne of the Lord, where He will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever." (Chap. xliii. 1-7.)‖

It is remarkable that in these Angelic likenesses as described by Ezekiel (chap. i. 10), the domestic natures Man and Ox, should be found in union with the wild natures of the Lion and the Eagle. Yet, though remarkable, it is in harmony with the prophetic word concerning the Day of the Lord, when it announces the return of the wild natures to their original state before Sin came in to destroy the peace of Creation. When "the Rod out of the Stem of Jesse"—i.e. when David's son—shall be on David's throne wielding the Sceptre of Righteousness, the lawless natures of both man and beast shall be subdued before Him. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together: they shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy Mountain, saith the Lord."¶

6. Men, children, and living creatures of the hand of the Creator

---

* Psa. lxxii. 7, 8, 17.
† Rom. viii. 20-22.
‡ Acts iii. 19-21.
§ Hab. ii. 14.
‖ I stop not here to refute the ideas that the Living Creatures represent the Church, or that they are the judicial executives of the Throne: their description in the text harmonising them with the other features, and the Scriptures adduced I think sufficiently declare what they are.
¶ Isa. xi. 1-9.

Digitized by Google

seem to have their Angelic representatives before Him.* The Cherubim may therefore find their place and occupation when they are seen to surround the Throne of "the Lord of the whole earth," responsive in His hearing to the sorrowful condition of Creation below; a truth that will be ever more apparent when the cries of the Living Creatures are heard to follow the opening of the Seals. (Rev. vi.) In our present chapter they are hopefully anticipative; and, if there be a doubt of this because they are heard to join in the Song of Redemption of chap. v., be it remembered that Creation that can *groan* on earth, in the day of wrong, may well *sing* in Heaven in that of assured deliverance. Moreover, a dumb ass has before now been given a voice whereby to "rebuke the madness of a prophet."†

Such is the Throne of the Inheritance, reserved in Heaven for the Overcomers of this life, who are kept by the power of God, *through faith*, unto THE DAY which is ready to be revealed at the appearing of Jesus Christ. Its perfected features were given to the Seer to behold in a vision, each and all of which proclaim that from its power and light the blighting curse shall flee away (Rev. xxii. 3); that it shall be the Heavenly source of prosperity and peace to the righteous, of safety and abundance to the poor and needy, of fertility and fruitfulness to hills and fields, and of blessing to all.

The wicked and the lawless alone shall tremble. It is with such a prospect that we listen to the "glory, honour, and thanks" that are rendered to Him who sat upon the Throne, and to the loftier strains of adoration with which the Elders are occupied as they cast their crowns before Him, acknowledging by this act that they are received through the riches of His Grace, for that He only is "worthy to receive glory, honour, and power;" they are more blessed in owning His Crown than in possessing their own. He it was who first created all things "very good," and, in their restoration to goodness and redemption from the baneful effects that sin has brought upon Creation, He shall find His good pleasure and everlasting delight.

THE TWO WITNESSES.

As soon as—as in the last chapter (Rev. x.)—God utters a voice declarative of His purpose to interfere *directly* with the earth; to give the Kingdoms of it into the hands of "whomsoever He will," or, as the Prophet says, "to Him whose right it is," and to "remove the diadem and crown" from the present high ones; we are, as in the present chapter (xi.), thrown at once into the midst of prophetic objects that will then be recognised and accepted—the Temple and its worshippers, with the Altar of burnt-offering, distinctly viewing them as separated from such as still lie under Divine displeasure, Jerusalem, and the outer court; for the command to "measure" signifies to set apart for Him who owned the parts measured, as contrasted with those "left out." The general profession of corrupted Judaism is here openly denounced, whilst true worshippers in the fear of God rather than of man, acknowledging the significance of His Altar and the

* Matt. xviii. 10; Acts. xii. 15; Rev. i. 20. † 2 Pet. ii. 16.

Digitized by Google

power of His Word, are recognised. Jerusalem is still called "the Holy City" in view of its coming glory,* and because a preservative Remnant of faithful ones will be in it as salt in the midst of corruption; even though its honour be in the dust, its palaces in ruins, and though it is to be brought to a still deeper condition of humiliation by subjection to a final ruinous and devastating siege, when the passions of frantic infidels will pollute its inhabitants, and its "spoil shall be divided in its midst;"† "The holy City shall they tread under foot forty and two months" (ver. 2)—a literal period corresponding to the *literal* 1260 days of the verse immediately following, also to the half *hebdomad* of three-and-a-half years of Dan. ix. 26, 37, and finally to the "forty and two months" of the baneful reign of the Beast (Rev. xiii. 5).

2. The last ray of mercy that will shed light on the gathering darkness of this crisis of the world's doom is the promised appearance of two special Witnesses who will have been long prepared for this hour of their testimony. With reference to which action on the part of God, let it be remembered that, the age of Grace having ended, the period towards which the Trumpet warnings point is one of strict judicial action, when the Law will reassert its dread claims to obedience. But "the Law worketh wrath;" it also required its sentence of condemnation to be substantiated "at the mouth of two or three Witnesses."‡ There is a righteous necessity therefore for "two Witnesses," ere the penalties of the Law be inflicted on ungodly myrmidons of a depraved despotism. Though these Witnesses are not here named, and it is at all times unwise to resort to conjecture or to go beyond the revelation of Scripture, I yet think that in the pages of the Word itself there is such indication of whom they will be that I do not shrink from *the simple expression of opinion*. That one will be "Elijah the Prophet"§ admits of no question, since Malachi has distinctly said that he shall be sent "before the coming of the great and dreadful Day of the Lord."‖ The other has generally been supposed to be Moses—and I once thought so myself—both from his companionship with Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration, as well as from the character of the plagues over which the witnesses will have power. This evidence is favourable enough as far as it goes, but there is one statement in the Word of Truth that I think must exclude Moses. "*It is appointed* unto men *once* to die" before they are judged.¶ Now Moses had died once, and, as these witnesses are both to be slain, it follows that they must be men who have not tasted death once. Enoch therefore presents the greater claim to the honour of being the second witness. He was a Prophet like unto Elijah; and there must have been some valid reason why his

---

* Isa. xlix. 16. † Zech. xiv. 1, 2. ‡ Deut. xvii. 6; Heb. x. 28.

§ It is maintained by some that Mal. iv. 5, 6, was fulfilled by John the Baptist, because he came before the first Advent of Christ "in the spirit and power of Elias." True, he did act a preparatory part on that occasion such as Elijah once did (1 Kings xviii.), and such as Elijah will again perform "before the second Advent of the Lord." But when a commission of Priests and Levites was sent to John asking him, "Who art thou, art thou Elias?" he said, "I AM NOT." This is decisive. (John i. 21.)

‖ Mal. iv. 5. ¶ Heb. ix. 27.

Digitized by Google

prophetic words have been preserved for the latter days. Is it not because the scenes amidst which the sentence of condemnation may once more be uttered will closely resemble those in which he first denounced the deeds of ungodly sinners? "The earth was filled with violence," there were giants in wickedness, and "the imagination of the thoughts of men's hearts were *only evil continually*."* The world of that period must have been ripening for judgment when Enoch was taken out of it as an Overcomer of his day. The prophecy of Enoch was certainly proclaimed before the flood, but, like other Prophets under the power of the Spirit of Christ, he spoke not only for his own time, but more especially for our information who have the Spirit of discernment † It would seem likely, moreover, that Jude has given us the spirit rather than the letter of the prediction, from his allusion to the coming of the Lord with His saints (Jude 14), an evident reference to Rev. xix. 11-14.

3. Two *false* witnesses gave evidence that led to the crucifixion of the Lord of glory, the Christ of God;‡ two true Witnesses, with the unction of the Spirit and the Light brought from Heaven, will give evidence to His Resurrection and return in power and great splendour to destroy the destroyers of His City and Sanctuary and to inaugurate a dominion of Righteousness and Peace. It is not here yet the seven-branched Candlestick, or Lampstand of the Tabernacle alluded to by Zechariah (chap. iv.), symbolic of the future testimony of corporate priestly Israel in the Kingdom; but it will be a powerful Light that prepares the way for it, borne by "the two anointed ones" that "stand before the God of the earth," corroborating the Divine claims as set forth by the mighty Angel of Rev. x. They will be as their Lord was on earth; they will have to do with infidel Jews and the Beast out of the Abyss; He had to do with scoffing and infuriated Pharisees, priests, and Scribes, and the Beast on the throne of the Cæsars.§ The result, too, will be similar; they will be, as He was, preserved from death‖ till their testimony is completed, when they will be slain and their death rejoiced over¶ because of the torment that their prophecies and plagues will occasion. After three days and a half they shall be quickened by the Spirit of God; and, as it was with their Divine Master, so will it be with them, a cloud will receive them out of the sight of men.** Fear coupled with astonishment will seize upon their enemies as they behold the phenomenon, but how much more when they feel the earth reel to and fro, shattering a tenth part of the dwellings of the City, and burying seven thousand men beneath the ruins! A harbinger this, though, to the suffering Remnant, for, whilst they too will be alarmed at the crash and desolation in the City, it will tell them that they are remembered of God, and will "give Him glory."

4. How exceedingly solemn all this is! Alas, how sadly true that, as it was in the days of the Son of Man, so shall it be in the days of His two Witnesses! The persecution, the scoffing, the blasphemy will all be directed against Him and the Divinity of His Person, yet hard

---

* Gen. vi. 1-11. with Jude 14-16.
† 1 Pet. i. 10-12.
‡ Matt. xxvi. 60, 61.
§ Dan. vii. 7.
‖ Heb. v. 7.
¶ Compare John xvi. 20.
** Acts i. 9.

Digitized by Google

indeed will those murderous apostates find it to kick against the goads. Such examples of an infatuated and corrupt nature of man, the "imagination of the thoughts of whose heart" has ever been progressively evil, might serve as an alarm to the sceptical dwellers on earth at this present time, for the voice of the Trumpet is not yet silent. "To-DAY if ye will hear His voice harden not your hearts," for "of *how much sorer punishment* than those of the provocation of old "shall he be thought worthy who treads under foot the Son of God, and despises the Spirit of Grace?"

THE DEATH OF THE BODY NOT THE EXTINCTION OF THE SOUL.

PART I.

(*Continued from page* 136.)

ADEQUATELY to represent the thought which filled his mind is probably the occasion of the Apostle's use of the mixed metaphor of the tent and the vesture, to figure his material earthly body. "For we who are in the tent are ever sighing, being weighed down; on which [account] we are not wishing to unclothe ourselves, but to clothe ourselves over, in order that the mortal may be swallowed up by the life." (Rotherham.) Alford renders, "that our mortal part," etc. This indicates very plainly that the Apostle regarded himself as possessed of a distinguishably mortal part separable from his inner nature which quickened to a new and heavenly life, should not perish, though the mortal part should, but be reserved for clothing upon with a body of immortal vigour, an imperishable vesture. If the mortal part should survive till the Lord should come, then would it, in place of dying, "be at once swallowed up by life, absorbed in and transmuted by that glorious principle of life which our new clothing shall superinduce upon us." (Alford.)

"But He who wrought us out unto this very thing [is] God, who gave us the earnest of the Spirit." This is God's arrangement, God's design, for the accomplishment of which He has been executing preparatory work in us; and not, we may be sure, restricting the work to such as shall survive in body to the resurrection morning. Of this he has graciously given us reliable security by imparting his Spirit to us as a very earnest. "Αρραβων," says Bengel, "means *earnest money*, which is given in advance as a security for the subsequent payment in full." And he quotes the remark of Isidore Hispal., "An earnest is to be complemented, not deducted. He, then, who has an earnest, does not restore it as a pledge, but looks for its completion." "Such an earnest," adds Bengel, "is the Spirit itself, Eph. 1-14. Thus, too, we are said to have the first fruit of the Spirit, Rom. viii. 23." That earnest we venture to believe, will hold good as a personal endowment until the complete "redemption of the purchased possession." To withdraw that earnest from the soul when despoiled of its tent covering

Digitized by Google

would be, in our conviction, to falsify *the earnest*, to destroy the very purpose for which, *as an earnest*, it was given. But this is not of God to do, for he "is faithful."

Certainly its possession gave confidence to the Apostle, "Therefore," he says, "we are always confident, knowing (not, says Alford, "as *the ground of our confidence*, but *correlative to it*, and the ground of the contentment expressed below), that, remaining at home in the body, we are away from home, from the Lord, still we are confident, and are willing (well-pleased) rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." Rotherham renders, "to go from home out of the body, and to come home unto the Lord." The contrast plainly is not of absence from one body and presence with another, of going out from home in a carnal body to enter a new home in a spiritual body; but it lies in quitting the earthly body to be present,—not, as appears, in a body at all,—with the Lord. Alford's brief and pertinent exposition is, "If (as in ver. 1) a dissolution of the body be imminent, even that, though not according to our wish, does not destroy our confidence: for so sensible are we, that dwelling in the body is a state of banishment from the Lord, that we prefer to it even the alternative of dissolution, bringing us, as it will, into his presence." "Wherefore," continues St. Paul (having this confidence, a confidence that stands unshaken, whether we be called to die, and so to pass naked, bodiless, into the presence of the Lord, or whether we remain alive in the flesh till he come) "we are also ambitious, whether at home (in the body), or away from home (out of the body), to be well-pleasing to him."

Such we believe to be the lesson of St. Paul as bearing upon our subject. He knew that there is such a thing as nakedness of soul, of yet existent, yet surviving self. His confidence was, to be found of the Lord, though it might be out of the body at his coming, a confidence grounded on the possession of God's gift to him of the earnest of his Spirit. Therefore, affliction amid seen things, he lightly esteemed; he fainted not under all the tribulation to be endured in labouring to impart the Gospel: for he knew that though his outward man might, his inward man would *never* perish. Thank God! for Paul's faith, and the statement of his ground of hope, to which we, too, ardently cling.

In illustration of the Apostle's likening his mortal body to a tent or tabernacle, in which his soul or self abode while he remained on earth, there is an interesting passage in the apocryphal Book of Wisdom, ch. ix. 14, 15, which we think worth citing: "The thoughts of mortal men are miserable, and our devices are but uncertain. For the corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthy tabernacle (*σκῆνος γεῶδες*) weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things."

And St. Peter, too, uses the same figure in the same unquestionable sense, 1 Epis. i. 13, 14. "I think it meet," he says, "as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that speedy is the putting off of my tabernacle (or tent), even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." Can the tabernacle be justly regarded as the Apostle who was *in* it. Or could there be a putting off of *that* which is the very substance of the being from whom it was to be put off? I may put off my coat; even though it were a living part of me, I might put it off. But if my

Digitized by Google

coat were myself, this would not be so possible. No one could take my coat off from itself. Neither could one put off a tent or tabernacle from itself.

And this putting off of his tently body, St. Peter speaks of in the next verse as his "decease," his exodus, his departure. Is this congruous with the thought of soul. of self-dissolution? If physical death were acknowledged to be personal extinction, should we with one consent speak of it, as men do, and as Scripture warrants, our *departure* hence? No, there would be no exodus, no path out for the soul or self, if the body in dying destroyed this very self, if the dismantling of the soul should in the very act extinguish it. Now let us ponder a word of our Lord's. He says (John xii. 24), "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." We have it, then, on the highest authority that except a grain of corn *die*, it does not germinate; but *if* it die, then does it abundantly fructify. And this is confirmed by our own observation (to which, no doubt, our Lord appeals), of the course of nature. But, what is this? Is *the dead* grain *alive?* Or, does it not rather become extinct? Observe, however, that it is *it*, the grain that dies, and *when* it dies, or even rather in consequence of its dying, that brings forth much fruit. It is out of it in death that its ampler and more glorious life comes forth. And this life can *only* come through its death. Is it not manifestly true, then, that *its* "life is preserved through death?" And if it be so with the grain, is it so very absurd to expect it of ourselves, to whom the promise is given, that we "shall not die for ever?"

Ay, and doth our Lord say this for the grain's sake? Or, is it not altogether for our sakes that he said it? adding immediately, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this age shall keep it unto life eternal."

But we have further substantiation of this truth of *the survival of the soul beyond the body's death*, in the verification of this word in our Lord's own person, as indeed he expressly declared that it should be verified. Saith he to the Jews (John ii. 19): "Destroy [take down] this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." "He spoke of the temple of His body" (ver. 21). Let the Jews destroy his body (they could go no farther in the work of destruction, as our Lord himself testifies), and he would raise it in three days. Now we know that in their malice they did the utmost that they could to him in the way of destruction. And we know, too, that Jesus made good his own prediction; for, "when he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them" (ver. 22).

And note, the Lord himself rears anew the tabernacle or temple of his body. "I will raise it up." Was, in this case, "the dead alive?" We think there can be no question of it. For we do not suppose that it will be denied that Jesus truly died, and that he, the same Jesus, when dead, resuscitated his erst mortal frame. He says of himself (John x. 17, 18): "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." Again I ask, Was the *dead* Saviour *alive*

Digitized by Google

when, being dead, he had the power given him to resume his laid down life?

St. Peter testifies concerning *him*,—"Whom God raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." (Acts ii. 24.) Our Lord, then, when dead, as Peter and the prophetic psalmist, from whom he quotes, bear witness, endured pains, throes, in and by death, pains that were loosed, released, as well as bands that were loosed, relaxed, by the act of his resurrection. Does this look like extinction? or even unconsciousness? And our Lord, we are assured, was released because it was not *possible* for HIM to continue "holden" by death. He, even when under the power of death, rose superior in power to death, vanquished it, burst its bonds and requickened his own body. Who, then, shall say that our Lord's soul was dead, while the life was extinct from his bodily frame? And if our Lord lived in soul through his death in body, why may not his members? If he was alive in death, why may not they be too?

And so, from another word of his, we also gather that they are and shall be. Our Lord is discoursing to the Jews (John vi.), urging them to come to him that they may have life. "Work," he says (ver. 27), "not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which *abides* unto life everlasting which the Son of Man will give to you;" and working for this food in the way of God's appointment, he explains to mean, the believing "on him whom [God] hath sent." This food he describes as "the true [the real] bread from heaven," which "my Father giveth you," contrasting it with the *manna* which God had bestowed from heaven upon the Israelites of old. "For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." And then our Lord proclaiming HIMSELF to be this bread: "Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." And he declares it to be his "Father's will" "that of all which he hath given me, I should not lose [any] of it, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." And he affirms in most emphatic and direct speech, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that Bread of Life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness *and died*. This is the Bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, *and not die*. I am the living Bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: and the Bread which I will give is *my flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world." . . . "As . . . I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is the Bread which came down from heaven: *not as your fathers did eat manna and died; he that eateth this bread shall live for ever*,"—shall live into that age. Now I contend that there is no interval of extinction contemplated here; no such interval allowed for or permitted here; indeed, no such interval possible. The life given is regarded as dependent on the bread eaten. And when, we would ask, is this bread offered and taken? Now, in this present life? Or, not till after the resur-

Digitized by Google

rection? Without controversy, NOW. The eating of the Bread of Life is the believing with the heart unto righteousness, on the name of the forth-sent Son of God. And they that eat live (ver. 57), live by the eating; and live onward for ever in unfailing life by virtue of this food given and eaten. No breach is possible in this life: our Lord's declaration is as explicit as words can make it. And this being so, what becomes of the doctrine of the temporary extinction of the saints individually?

Similarly we may argue the perpetuity of the personal life of the renewed in soul from John iv. 13, 14.

And if we look to the *origin* of the spiritual life in the soul of man, we are impressed with the same conviction of its being an unfailing life. Our Lord says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." And his apostle teaches us that "he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption: but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Such an one *has* been "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever;" whilst "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass." Whether, then, we regard this life in relation to its source and generation, or to its sustenance and thereby conservation, we are inevitably drawn to the conclusion that it is and will be a permanent, an uninterrupted life. The bread and the water which the Lord administers to the new-born of God can never fail in effectual power to support the already new-created life. And hath not the Lord himself said, as we have already quoted, that of all which the Father hath given him he would lose nothing?

G. A. HAYWARD.

(To be concluded in our next.)

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

ARTICLE II.

IT may be felt as an objection to the truth of that impression of David's character which the sketch in our previous article is likely to produce, —that David's having been selected to witness in so distinguished a manner to the struggle and final victory of the Kingdom of Christ, any estimate of his character which unduly offends by its incongruity, must in consequence be a wrong one.

It will, we think, be sufficient to dispel this idea to draw attention to what is observably true of the conduct of all really great characters in reference to associates.

A man of unchallengeable excellence can afford to run counter to all suggestions of worldly prudence and to scorn the danger of misconception, when, from his knowledge of and determination to recognise real worth at the base of a character which has suffered, perhaps, more than one temporary eclipse, he refuses to discard his acquaintance, and—acting in the same unconventional manner—seeking only truth in the inward parts—carelessly allows a number of persons of faulty or doubtful reputations to connect themselves with him, knowing full well,

Digitized by Google

the impossibility of man's false judgment doing anything to alter the real integrity of his spirit, to tarnish his zeal for righteousness, or impugn the truth of his humility.

It is the weak and would-be-great men—whose reputations rest on insecure and uncertified foundations—who are nervous about the people they take up with, and are eager in their hunt after and choice in their selection of persons who will be known as their associates, or will be affiliated in any recognisable way with their careers and aims. God it is, who may well put us upon starts and surprises at the sort of men whom he has allowed to be recognised as types of his own glorious Son. That glorious Son himself dispels all possible misconceptions that might arise from the infirmity of his types. And God it is, who reading the heart, overturns the estimates of men respecting their neighbours, regarding each one not according to the product of his life's conditions, but according to the relative distribution of advantages and disadvantages and the different measure in which to each the force of temptation was apportioned to the power of resistance. By which, doubtless, is to be vindicated the exaltation to honour of men whom the struggle with evil did not leave wholly unscarred, while comparative neglect enshrouds the blameless life which had never been called upon to face a fiery trial. Thus then Gideon and Samson, and David and Solomon with all their barbaric defects shall claim typical relationship to Christ, while one pre-eminent star, hanging over the birthplace of history and of civilisation—the irreproachable and lustless Joseph—needed not that Scripture should say anything of its typical significance, for that stands self-revealed.

And we may remark in passing, that such considerations cannot fail to suggest much to us as to the principles upon which Christ the Antitype will finally judge mankind. In how much that is accounted by men the filth and offscouring of the world does not he discern glorious potentialities, which only removal to another world can possibly develop. Potentialities such as existed in the black scum of the factory, which accidentally placed by the chemist under suitable conditions suddenly surprised him with the hues of the rainbow.

It will now be convenient to consider the manner in which David uses the term "enemies." Were his enemies always God's enemies? Was it a moot point whether David's "foes" (in the warrior's sense) found themselves innocently arrayed against him or not? It is certain that many of God's enemies were fighting on David's side, and as we have already hinted, it is not improbable that he had often to pray for the overthrow of their machinations. But he ought to have gone further and disbanded the Adullamites. As a king anointed to rule in righteousness, he ought to have sent back the debtors to work off their debts, for that was their first duty instead of abetting an insurrection,—for what was self-defence in David was an insurrection in them,—and counselled the discontented and disaffected that their habit of mind was neither pleasing to God nor serviceable to man. These enemies of God, however, being on his side he could not pray for *their* overthrow.

Might not, however, many of the friends of God have been found fighting on the side of Saul. Many conscientiously obeying the anointed constituted authority, many compelled by tyrannous conscription, many

Digitized by Google

in various innocent ways finding themselves entangled in such a mesh of circumstances, as that while secretly with David they were openly with Saul, and yet the dull sweep of David's eye penetrating no further than their leathern shields, identifies them all as enemies, and cries unto God against them with a fervour of vindictiveness such as stands without a parallel in all written compositions.

From a perusal of the imprecatory Psalms, it is impossible to discover that David exercises any discrimination as to the elements of the hosts that oppose him, whether followers of Saul, of Ishbosheth, or of Absalom, and while for technical purposes it is convenient for nations to call the forced levies that make war upon them enemies, it was unknown even in barbarous heathen nations to include in imprecations upon them the children's children to remote posterity.

As against this it may be said that David, in one passage at all events, shows us that God's enemies were his, but while this may be granted, it will be seen that it is altogether a different thing to count our enemies God's. David was right in the one case, but the presumptions are that he made great mistakes in the other.*

A perusal of the passages, however, will show how completely, even when radically right, he dwelt in the shadow and the twilight that preceded the Gospel.

"Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee, and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee; yea, I hate them with perfect hatred, I count them mine enemies." (Ps. cxxxix.) 20, 21.) Doubtless, David of all poets was dowered with the "hate of hate" God-ward, but while it is God-like to hate the moral condition of the God-hater, it is wholly ungodlike to hate him and count him an enemy.

Here indeed we trench on tremendous difficulties, for although in a meaningless way, it is often on the lips of evangelists to testify their love of sinners whom they never saw in their lives before, and to speak of separating the sinner from his sins, yet when the cruelty of sin has been visibly spawned in our presence and divine resentment has flamed up high within us, kindling our love of righteousness to its whitest glow, it is inconceivably difficult to accomplish that dissection. Nay, the diviner we are, the more difficult to us mortals. Nevertheless we have the sure word of prophecy: "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." This declaration of what God is being just at the opposite pole of the sentiment which David avows with such evident satisfaction.

But it may be said, granting that David speaks in ignorance and blindness and is venting the passions of the natural man, as might be expected in one who appears in history a thousand years behind the Gospel, might not God take him with his wrath "which worketh not the righteousness of God," and his "enemies" whom he presumes also to know as God's enemies, and make his imprecations, prophecies, and bloody deeds, serve as types and foreshadowings of the righteous judg-

* Not however in respect to those of whom he says,—"They also that render evil for good are mine adversaries because good is my pursuit." (*Horsley.*) Psa. xxxviii. 20.

Digitized by Google

ments upon the really deserving, which in the day of wrath will fall, and fall upon the truly deserving? Doubtless this is the only true sense in which the imprecatory psalms are in anywise a revelation of God to us; but let it be remembered the question we are considering is not whether God will not one day judge the world in righteousness, but whether the spirit that breathes in these Psalms and the treatment that his enemies met with at David's hands are a "revelation" to us of the spirit in which Christ will judge the world and the manner in which his judgment will be inflicted.

We shall best arrive at a true conclusion respecting *that* by a comparison of the Imprecatory Psalms with New Testament teaching respecting enemies.

David prayed:—

"Destroy thou them, O God." (Ps. v. 10) "Arise, O Lord, in thine anger, lift up thyself because of the rage of mine enemies." (Ps. vii. 6.)

David exulted:—

"I have pursued mine enemies and overtaken them, neither did I turn again till they were consumed. I have wounded them that they were not able to rise: they are fallen under my feet. For thou has girded me with strength unto the battle: thou hast subdued under me those that rose up against me. Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies; that I might destroy them that hate me. They cried, but there was none to save them: even unto the Lord, but he answered them not. Then did I beat them small as the dust before the wind: I did cast them out as the dirt in the streets." (Psa. xviii. 37-52.)

David prayed:—

"Give them according to the deeds, and according to the wickedness of their endeavours: give them after the work of their hands; render to them their desert." (Psa. xxviii. 4.)

"Let their way be dark and slippery, and let the angel of the Lord persecute them. . . . Let destruction come upon him at unawares; and let his net that he hath hid catch himself; into that very destruction let him fall." (Psa. xxxv. 6, 8.)

David said:—

"Mine eye hath seen its desire upon mine enemies." (Psa. liv. 7. *Perowne.*)

David prayed:—

"Let death surprise them; let them go down alive to Hades, for wickedness is in their dwelling; in their inward part." (Psa. lv. 15. *Delitzsch.*)

"Thou, therefore, O Lord God of hosts, the God of Israel, awake to visit all the heathen: be not merciful to those who are atrociously faithless." (*Delitzsch.*) "But thou, O Lord, shalt laugh at them; thou shalt have all the heathen in derision. . . . God shall let me see my desire upon mine enemies. . . . Consume them in wrath, consume them that they may not be." (Psa. lix. 5, 8, 10, 13.)

David represents the Lord as saying,—

"That thy foot may be dipped in the blood of thine enemies, and that the tongue of thy dogs have its share of the same." (Psa. lxviii. 23, *Delitzsch.*)

David or another prayed:—

Digitized by Google

"Let their table become a snare before them, and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not; and make their loins continually to shake. Pour out think indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful indignation take hold of them. . . . Add iniquity unto their iniquity, and let them not come into thy righteousness. Let them be blotted out of the book of Life (Delitzsch), and not be written with the righteous." (Psa. lxix. 22-24, 27, 28; comp. Rom. xi. 9, 10.)

David, or Jeremiah, or another prayed:—

"Pour out thy fury upon the heathen who know thee not, and over the kingdoms which call not upon thy name. (Perowne and Delitzsch.) Wherefore should the heathen say, Where is their God? Let him be known among the heathen in our sight by the avenging of the blood of thy servants which is shed." (Psa. lxxix. 6-10.)

David prayed:—

"Set thou a wicked man over him, and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged let him be condemned, and let his prayer become sin. Let his days be few and let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless and his wife a widow. Let his children be continually vagabonds and beg; let them entreat bread far from their ruined houses. (Perowne and Delitzsch.) Let there be none to extend mercy to him, neither let there be any to favour his fatherless children. Let his posterity be cut off, and in the generation following let their name be blotted out. *Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with the Lord; and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out.* Let them be before the Lord continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth. Because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart. As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him: as he delighted not in blessing so let it be far from him. As he clothed himself with cursing as with a garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually. Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul." (Psa. cix. 6-20.)

A Psalmist says,—

"O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." (Psa. cxxxvii. 8, 9.)

Concerning portions of the preceding, many things require to be said in a succeeding article. We have now simply to contrast with them THE TEACHING OF CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES.

CHRIST said:—

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." (Matt. v. 43-45.)

CHRIST said:—

Digitized by Google

"Love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." (Luke vii. 35, 36.) "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." (Matt. vi. 15.)

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." (Matt. vii. 12.)

"Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." (Luke xxiii. 34.)

Paul said:—

"For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." (Rom. xi. 22.)

"Bless them which persecute you; bless and curse not. . . . Recompense to no man evil for evil. . . . Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." (Rom. xii. 17, 19-21.)

"Owe no man anything but to love one another, for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. . . Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. xiii. 8, 10.)

"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another; even as God in Christ hath forgiven you." (Eph. iv. 31, 31.)

"I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands without wrath or doubting." (1 Tim. ii. 8.)

James saith:—

"Ye have condemned and killed the Just One, he doth not resist you. . . . Take, my brethren, the prophets who have spoken in the name of the Lord for an example of suffering affliction and of patience. Behold, we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy." (James v. 6, 10, 11.)

Peter exhorted,—

"Not to render evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing." (1 Pet. iii. 9.)

Jesus said:—

"Verily I say unto you, . . . Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." (Matt. xviii. 3, 6.)

"For I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do alway behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." (Ver. 10.)

* Henry Deacon.

(To be continued.)

Digitized by Google

LITERATURE.

The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishments briefly considered. By the Rev. John Henry Rowlatt, M.A. London: Elliot Stock.

THIS pamphlet adds one to the number of publications on the great discussion, but it does not throw much fresh light on the subject. Still it has the interest of showing that the theological reformation of the day is engaging the attention of many minds, a fact in which we rejoice.

The Eastern Question in the light of Scripture. Being a short Examination of the Prophecies concerning the Time of the End; with a Word of Warning to the Church and the World. To which is also appended a copy of the Will of Peter the Great. By W. D. Glasgow: Porteous Brothers, West Nile-street.

A thoughtful pamphlet, worthy of attentive perusal. The author takes what we believe is the right view of the question. Secular writers and statesmen will blunder on, until their eyes are opened to the fact that the Eastern Question involves the restoration of the Jews to Palestine.

Ought Protestant Christians to circulate Romish Versions of the Word of God? Being the First Prize Essay "On the Origin, Growth, and Effects of the Circulation of Romish and other Corrupted Versions of the Holy Scriptures in Foreign Countries, by a large section of Protestant Christians; and on the best means of putting an end to this pernicious practice." By the Rev. Brewin Grant, B.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Bethnal Green. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, Newgate-street.

THE fact that one hundred and one essays were sent to the Committee of the Trinitarian Bible Society, is proof conclusive that its protest against the British and Foreign Bible Society, for circulating certain Romish versions of the Scriptures in Foreign Countries, is fully endorsed by a great number of English Christians. Mr. Grant's essay is marked by clearness, incision, force. As an argument, it leaves nothing to be desired; and we have great pleasure in adding that it is uniformly courteous to the good men whose false expediency it so powerfully exposes. Those who wish to understand the matter fully had better order this book, as we have no room for further explanation.

Do we meet only in the Name of the Lord Jesus? Observations addressed to the Brethren. London: Elliot Stock.

WE wish the "Brethren" referred to would read and profit by these wise and judicious observations.

NOTICES.

AN esteemed correspondent in Canada writes: "Your discourse on 'The Rich Man and Lazarus' should commend itself to every intelligent Christian freeman. It is a most satisfactory exposition of this sadly abused parable. All, however, are not in reality freemen. The fears of the charge of heresy, and the loss of position, power, and emolument,

Digitized by Google

form a veil through which the truth passes dimly and with difficulty. I have reprinted here your paper on 'The Ministry of Evil.' It is in my opinion calculated to meet the natural inquiry of honest sceptics as to the anomaly supposed to be obvious—the existence of evil and suffering under the government of a Supreme Being possessed of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, a God of Love, whose tender mercies are over all his works. This tract answers the question, and so as to commend the reply to the intelligent and sincere inquirer after truth. I have published two thousand of them, and will sow them broadcast over the country. Our Provincial Legislature is now sitting in Toronto, and the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa, and I propose sending tracts to the members of both Houses.'

"P. P. T."—It is obvious to all who *think*, that without personal conviction, nothing worth doing can be done in the world. To float listlessly down the stream of life, without regard to its imperial demands upon personal responsibility—to accept passively as the very truth of Heaven, without doubt, and therefore without examination, all that "Theology" labels genuine—and to take no intelligent and decided part in the momentous questions that are now shaking Christendom to its centre, is not worthy of any one who claims the name of *Man*, and is simply shameful in the case of one who wishes to be recognised as a CHRISTIAN MAN. If these words are strong, it is the strength of deep personal conviction. "We believe and therefore speak." Every one who prefers divine truth to stereotyped error should fearlessly say so. There is no time to lose; the day of account hastens; and our MASTER *deserves* loyal witnesses.

RAINBOW, VOL. XIII.—Our Publisher has a few copies of last year's volume remaining for sale, which he will send, carriage paid, on receipt of P.O. Order for 7s. 6d., the published price. This volume contains a great number of articles by the most able writers on our special subjects, and would form a useful present to Christian friends.

A SLIP OF THE PEN.—Mr. Laing writes: "Will you oblige me by stating that by a slip of my pen, the word '*pre*millennial,' instead of 'millennial,' occurs twice near the top of page 129 in last month's RAINBOW?"

SEEKING TO THE DEAD.—Mr. M. W. Strang writes:—"In the RAINBOW for February last, a correspondent claims that 'the possibility of conveying communications to living men by disembodied spirits of men is plainly implied' in Scripture 'in the seeking to the dead being forbidden." I am a little puzzled to know how far it may be legitimate to carry such a method of inference as this. The first Gentile converts to Christianity, for example, were warned to 'keep themselves from idols,' and to 'flee from idolatry.' Now, if the Scripture, in forbidding necromancy, must be held as sanctioning the beliefs on which the practice was founded, are we not bound by the same rule to suppose that by forbidding idolatry to the Corinthian converts, it was admitting the truth of the Grecian mythology? Yet Paul assures the same converts that "an idol is *nothing in the world*, and that there is none other God but one." (1 Cor. viii. 4.) Is it not, therefore, safer to conclude that a superstitious practice may be forbidden in the Scriptures without necessarily 'implying' the truth of the beliefs on which such a practice was based?"

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

MAY, 1877.

THE ENGLISH PULPIT.

THE interests of truth, the honour of God, and the highest welfare of the people alike demand, and at all times demand, fidelity on the part of the pulpit. But the intensity of thought which marks the present time gives unusual emphasis to the demand for faithfulness to the divine record in the case of our public teachers. Two remarkable facts, which seem at first sight irreconcilable, characterise the Sunday congregations of England. The first is that, as a rule, places of worship are more largely attended than heretofore. There is a strong desire to hear what the pulpit has to say, springing no doubt from the universal conviction that the world is nearing some extraordinary crisis which, whatever may be its essential character or mode of development, will remove some of the landmarks of our venerable theology, and introduce great changes into human thought on almost every subject.

The second fact is, that this ardent wish to receive light from the accredited leaders of religious thought is not, generally speaking, gratified. The *intelligent* occupants of the pew—and these are far more numerous than the pulpit imagines—are tired of fine essays or eloquent orations on some sentence or half-sentence quoted from psalmist, prophet, or apostle, upon which the essayist or orator builds his argument and shows what *he* can do in elaborating some principle or doctrine which may be both good and true in itself, but which utterly fails to shed light upon the awful and glorious realities of the impending crisis. The people want to hear what God has said concerning these last days; they wish for expositions of the divine word, readings from the inspired prophets of both Testaments, and clear unfoldings of Christ's teachings respecting his return for his Church and to his inheritance—the world. Men are wearied of theological wranglings and hair-splittings; of Calvinistic and Arminian "doctrines," of creeds and catechisms; and not before time. They want light, food, strength, the air of heaven to breathe, the will of heaven to guide. There is

Digitized by Google

a deep and a true conviction on many minds that there are truths in the Bible which have not yet been brought before our congregations generally.

The fierce falsehood of eternal torments is now abandoned by most men as an intolerable horror, which has no place whatever in the Word of God; but some ministers who have done this have unhappily wandered into regions of shoreless speculation about universal or partial restoration, for which in the testimony of Scripture they have no authority. Probably the chief reason which has led to this mistake is their still cherished belief in the pagan fiction of the natural immortality of the soul. Denying everlasting torment, and believing human deathlessness, restoration is of course the logical alternative, so that we have no difficulty in tracing the process of thought in the minds of the brethren to whom reference is made. But to supersede that which is obviously false by that which has no authority is not wise. What is gained by abandoning one huge error to embrace another? The gratification of a mere sentiment is not a sufficient answer, for this matter must be determined not by our wishes but by our Creator's will, and we may rest assured that his will is every way better than our wishes. Of course we expected diversity of speech when eschatology became the subject of discussion. It was inevitable that some degree of doctrinal confusion should arise upon the ruins of an exploded error.

Some men are slow of apprehension, and, with a praiseworthy sense of the sacredness of what they have been taught as religious truth, are reluctant to part with any notion, however incredible or awful in itself, which is supposed to be a part of "the faith." This conservative feeling springs from a good motive, and is therefore, and so far only, worthy of respect. But it will not bear a moment's criticism; for that which is incredible or awful *in itself* cannot be an integral part of a system which, avowedly and confessedly, had its origin in the love of God to man; and the more valuable a thing is, the more anxious should its friends be to keep it clean from the dust and bright from the rust which are so common in the world. The feeling which will not endure a speck of mildew on the sacred parchment, or a mob of chaffering money-changers in the Father's temple, is intellectually nobler and morally more beautiful than that which timidly shrinks from the removal of a hoary falsehood as if it were a buttress to eternal truth. Among the other false things which have darkened the story of man, a false piety has been none of the least. Intelligent loyalty is not reckless, but it is always fearless, and it does *not* mean to undermine the building when it puts forth a strong hand to tear away the parasites that the marble and gold of the glorious erection may flash back the light of the noon-day sun.

But there are other men who are quick in apprehending logical results, who see, as it were, by inspiration, or intuition—if you prefer the word—what must be the ultimate issue of a given doc-

Digitized by Google

trine. A long process of reasoning is not required in their case. They *can* reason, and that most rigidly, but whilst you are slowly piling up your scholastic argument with "this" and "that" and "therefore," they have reached the goal, and are calmly sitting with folded arms, smiling at your needless toil. The remarkable fact is that these men are almost always right. Careful subsequent examination proves that the conclusion reached is in harmony with Scripture. The reason is not difficult to find. The quick perception was really the effect of Scripture truth lodged in the mind, and perhaps long lodged there, although the rapid thinker may not have been conscious of the fact at the time. These are the men whose disagreeable lot it is to be misunderstood, and misrepresented, and evil spoken of in our churches. As a general rule this is what they get for heralding any great reformation, or bringing to the light of resurrection some long buried truth, that is to say, until they die, and then the empty compliment of having been before the age is paid to their dust.

Between these two types of mind there are many intermediate links which it would be a waste of time to particularise by characteristic epithets, even if it could be done correctly. Nor is it in the least needful to attempt this, as every one knows the fact. Indeed it is questionable whether anything short of a miracle could make all men think alike, and then it would speedily become questionable whether such a miracle could be a blessing. We are certain that it could not, and for that very reason equally certain that it will never be wrought. Heaven's miracles contemplate infinitely higher objects than a level uniformity of thought among men, which would make conversation a sleepy absurdity, discussion an impossibility, and pulpit ministration superfluous.

But does all this imply that there is any insuperable difficulty in ascertaining the meaning of Scripture respecting the nature of man, the character of God in Christ, the significance of redemption, and the future of the world and the church? No, it implies just the contrary. We have the truth of God declared to us on the points named. The lines of thought along which different minds travel, in relation to these points, will be different; but where there is an honest desire to accept revealed truth untarnished by the defiling touch of pagan philosophy, medieval tradition, or science falsely so-called, there is not the slightest doubt but that revealed truth will come home to the mind and the heart as a sublime and joyful reality. What the pulpit, therefore, has to do, ought to do, and must do, if it would discharge its duty to God and man in view of the supreme crisis to which all things are tending, is clear enough. It must lay aside with holy and resolute determination the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Episcopal church, and all the other creeds of Christendom—that is to say, lay them aside, so far as the *slightest idea of doctrinal* AUTHORITY is concerned—and accept and teach the plain declarations of Scripture

Digitized by Google

concerning life and death, the coming of Christ, the extinction of evil, and the glorious future when, in a cleansed and happy universe, without sin or sorrow, "God will be all in all."

The question, however, may be asked—Supposing the pulpit clothed with the moral strength necessary for this fearless testimony, would the pew endure it? We reply, undoubtedly, certainly! The devout and thoughtful in our assemblies would not only "endure" this heroic surrender of medieval dimness for cloudless apostolic light, but would exceedingly rejoice in it. This is not a supposition founded on the fact that sooner or later truth commends itself to all its friends, but on actual experience. At first the timid and the ill-instructed—the men who "need that some one teach them again the first principles of the oracle of God"—take the alarm, and depart to some congenial fold where the orthodox echoes of many generations form the pleasant lullaby of somnolent folks; but those who are alive to the responsibilities of moral life, and are consequently anxious to be living witnesses to God and his truth, will "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."

Of course there are men in some of our pulpits who are mentally incapable of realising the grandeur of an effort to return to apostolic doctrine at all hazards; men who, unconsciously to themselves, reveal the narrow limits of their vision by alluding contemptuously to the glorious truths of the second advent, and immortality only in Christ; and men from whom, therefore, it is absurd to expect anything in the battle which is now being waged between truth and error. But it is a fact that intelligent hearers of such men are perfectly weary of the infliction. They go to "church" or "chapel" from a mere sense of duty, and to set a good example to others, but as for life or joy in the service, the thing is unknown. We say therefore, with all emphasis, that if our ministers would become teachers and rise to the height of the great argument which the Divine book places before them; if they would throw their moral and mental strength, consecrated by the Holy Spirit, into the splendid battle for a divine immortality, and the pre-millennial return of our Lord; and if to facilitate their acquaintance with these sublime doctrines of Scripture, they would cast aside misleading formularies, they would find the best men and women of their congregations standing heartily by their side. Let the pulpit be true to God, and the pew will be true to it. ED.

THE SONG OF MOSES.

DEUTERONOMY XXXII.

THE reader need hardly be reminded that the Song of Moses, notwithstanding the narrative form of many of its allusions, is in the main prospective. Indeed, the pathetic words which introduce

Digitized by Google

it, distinctly declare that it is to stand as a perpetual witness for Jehovah in the face of that apostasy, which, however inevitable, cannot frustrate his ultimate benediction. Suitably therefore the climax of the song awakens the pæan which is quoted by two of the New Testament writers; extolling the Angel of the Covenant, and summoning the Gentiles to rejoice with his people. It was the beauty of the version of the late Henry Craik of Bristol (the colleague of Mr. George Müller), which first suggested the attempt to cast this song into English verse; and surely Mr. Craik's reputation for Hebrew scholarship may be permitted to carry some weight among those of us who are incapable of passing final judgment on disputed points. It is from his version, for instance, that the unusual expression occurring in the fifth verse has been fetched—viz, "That they are not his children is their disgrace." In some other respects, recourse has been had to the Septuagint version, especially in the eighth and forty-third verses; though of course it must be added that the exigencies of rhyme subvert any attempt to exhibit the faithful or literal rendering of any original. The closing verse, according to the Septuagint, varies so widely from our authorised Anglican version, that it may be as well to recite it; remarking at the same time that it derives authority from the fact of two of its clauses being quoted, word for word, in the New Testament; whereas, in their exact wording, these two passages occur no where else in the Old Testament.

"Rejoice ye Heavens with Him, and let all the angels of God worship Him. Rejoice ye Gentiles with his people, and let all the sons of God strengthen themselves in Him; for He will avenge the blood of His sons, and He will render vengeance, and recompense justice to His enemies; and will reward them that hate him. And the Lord shall purify the land of his people."—(Deut. xxxii. 43.)

THE SONG OF MOSES.

Give audience, O ye Heavens, and I will speak;
List to the utterance of my lips, O Earth!
And let the song prophetic which I seek
To pour on listening ears be deemëd worth
The homage of receptive hearts and true,
Distilling as the all-pervading dew,
Like the small rain upon the tender flower,
Or as the grass drinks in the falling shower.

Now when I celebrate Jehovah's name,
The greatness of our God let all proclaim.
He is the Rock. How faithful and how true
Are all his ways. His work is perfect too.
The God of Israël must ever be
True to himself; for just and right is he.
How vain and pérverse then
This generation of revolting men!

Digitized by Google

Ah—wayward and degenerate race,
Thus lightly to renounce the children's place,
Yet fondly fail to see that this is their disgrace.
Is this thy generous recompence
For all the guiding providence
Passing before thine eyes?
O—foolish and unwise!
Jehovah's fatherhood thy proud defence
Despoiled and robbed of reverence;
Forgotten the redemption which he won,
Forgotten how the welfare of a son
Dwells in a father's breast;
And e'en his kind behest
Thy state to 'stablish and exalt
Requited by a foul revolt!
Yet is he not thy Father still?
Ask what the chronicles reveal,
Recall the days gone by,
The senators of hoary name,
Whose words thy sires will ratify,
And elders tell the same.

When the Most High at first defined
The nations' limits, and assigned
To every tribe of Adam's race
A separate cognisance and place,
He fixed them by his sovereign word
That so their boundaries might accord
In number with the Angels of the Lord;
Those potent ministries of mystic name,
Ruling their several provinces; from whence,
Israel, Jehovah's portion then became,
Jacob, the lot of his inheritance.

Finding him wandering in a desert land,
He taught his loved one henceforth to rely
On no resource but his benignant hand,
And kept him as the apple of his eye.
Just as an eagle stirreth up
Her young; and, fluttering in their sight,
Beareth them on her spreading wings,
And thus invites to flight.
So did Jehovah lead him forth alone;
And, long as rival gods were all unknown,
Made him to reign among the wise and great,
The highest parts of earth to dominate,
To find in pastures fair a plenteous stock,
And gather oil and honey from the flinty rock.
Butter of kine and milk of sheep,
Such was thy never-failing meat;

Digitized by Google

Thy fatting-pens were all replete
With Bashan's breed of comeliest shape;
Thy nourishment the choicest wheat,
Thy drink the pure blood of the grape.

Jeshurun waxed fat. On every side
Encompassed round, enriched and amplified;
Alas his heart was waxing wanton too;
Sensuous and gross, reluctant to review
His heavenly origin, he straight withdrew
The fealty so imperatively due;
Forgat the God which had established him,
And held his natal rock in light esteem.
But lower sank the now apostate race,
When sorcery usurped the holy place
Of His paternal staff and rod;
When hearts with heathen spells enchained,
And hands with heathen vices stained,
Paid sacrifice to demons—not to God.
When rites fantastic, strange, and new,
Such as their fathers never knew,
That awful jealousy awoke,
None with impunity did ever yet provoke.

Now, saith Jehovah, shall they see,
My sons and daughters though they be,
Who abdicate their faith in me,
How lost to happiness are they
From whom I turn my face away.
Me have they moved to jealousy with those
Which are no gods, and ventured to up-rouse
With their fond vanities my indignation?
Then in like manner will I them oppose,
Move them to jealousy with alien foes,
And humble them before a foolish nation.
For, kindled in mine ire,
A devastating fire
Shall to the lowest Hades burn,
Quick to consume and overturn
The fertile earth with all her fruits,
And penetrate the very mountains' roots.
Calamities shall crowd upon them,
Mine arrows I will rain among them;
Famine's wide Tophet evermore enlarged,
The upper air with pestilence surcharged,
The teeth of beasts, and serpents' poisonous breath,
Such are my ministers of death.
The sword without, and wild despair within,
Blasting their offspring and their near of kin,
The warrior, with the bridegroom and the bride,
Yea, old and young—swept by one common tide
Of massacre, shall welter side by side.

Digitized by Google

Yea, more,—for it was in my mind
To chase them with a scattering wind,
And from the records of mankind
Their memory to out-blot,
But that I feared the taunting foe
To louder arrogance might grow;
For he, discerning not
My hand, will straightway magnify
His own achievement, and deny
The overruling power whereby
This ruin hath been wrought.

But must it be that the adopted race,
Though now bereft of counsel as of grace,
Shall always shun their heavenly Father's sight,
And never re-assert their own birthright?
O that they were but wise to apprehend
Their glorious destiny—their latter end.
Then might we yet behold
The arm of one true Israelite
A thousand foemen chase in fight,
And two—ten thousand put to flight;
Unless the Lord had sold
The only nation under Heaven
Whom he redeemed of old;
Unless their everlasting Rock
The children's confidence might mock.
But let it still be told,
How we, in scorn of their array,
Defy the enemy to say
The rock of their assurance may
Compare with our stronghold.

Full well we know the vines which Sodom yields,
The baleful product of Gomorrah's fields.
Fair to the vision though the clusters hang,
Fatal the clusters as the envenom'd fang
Of asp or dragon,—while their treacherous wine
Allures to bonds relentless, false, and serpentine.
These are the mysteries of mortal trial,
Among my treasures sealed up. Meanwhile
Vengeance and recompence to me belong;
The foe's supremacy shall soon be gone
Whose condemnation will not linger long.

For God himself will judge his people,
And for his servants' sake relent,
Soon as he sees their forces spent;
When decimated, faint and feeble,
Of foreign aid bereft,
With none shut up or left,

Digitized by Google

They learn the gods to execrate
Whose demon-cravings cruel as the grave
No holocaust could satiate.
Can such as these, O Israël,
Restore the health you crave
Who feasted on your sacrifice,
And drank the wine of your oblation,
But mocked your passionate appeal
For help in time of tribulation?
Will they arise and save?

See now that I alone am He,
Nor rival god is found with Me.
Mine is the sole prerogative
Death to pronounce or life to give.
And where I wound, or where I heal,
From my decree lies no appeal.
For lo! to heaven I lift my hand,
And say, I live for ever;
And if I whet my glittering brand
My chosen to deliver,
And execute the judgment due
For ages, on the hostile crew;
How will my arrows, flusht with gore,
Drunk with the carnage of that hour,
Strike through the victims of my power,
Whether they fight or flee;
How will my hungry sword devour
The flesh of captains, and the flower
Of all their chivalry!

Now let the heavenly powers on high
Take up the theme;
Let all the angels of our God
Him worship, him supreme;
Rejoice ye Gentiles with the host
He chooseth to redeem;
Ye sons of God now make your boast
Alone in him;
Who to his ancient covenant hath respect,
Who surely will avenge his own elect;
Will purge and sanctify the land
Where long the proud oppressor trod,
And make his people's final home
Pure as the dwelling place of God.

J. WAYLEN.

Digitized by Google

THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS ANALYSED.

THE following explanation of the parable of the ten virgins, is offered more suggestively than dogmatically. Let us take in order the various points arising for consideration.

I. *The Place of the Parable in the Prophecy.* The full record of the discourse on the Mount of Olives, can only be obtained by the careful combination of Matt. xxiv. 3-51; xxv. xxvi. 1-2; Mark xiii. 3-37; Luke xii. 35-48; xvii. 22-37, and xxi. 7-36. No part of Luke xii. or xvii. has been admitted as being part of the discourse, but the reasons for this exclusion appear insufficient, especially when we remember, that St. Luke does not always relate events in exact historical order; e.g. from reading the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in Luke alone, it might be supposed that Judas partook of it; from the combined account, it is evident that he did not. I would also remark that the Evangelists, in their several accounts of this prophetic discourse, do not, except in a very few instances, relate the same thing in slightly different words; but when two of them allude to a particular saying, each gives *part* of the words spoken, so that there is in reality little of repetition in their record. Thus, the accounts of the incident on leaving the temple may be combined as follows:—"And as Jesus went out, and departed from the temple, and some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, and his disciples came to him for to show him the buildings of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings!" Now, it will be observed, that the parable of the riotous servant is more fully related by Luke than by Matthew. Verses 47 and 48 of Luke xii. are not found in Matthew's account. Having laid down the principle that, to whomsoever much is given of him shall much be required; our Lord turns to the four disciples present, to whom, both in their personal and representative character, so much had been and was to be given, and exclaims, "And take heed to yourselves lest at any time (like the heart of the riotous servant of whom I have been speaking) *your* hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness." From Luke xxi. alone the reason of this warning is not evident: the combined account at once explains it. Luke does not here repeat the episode which he has already given in chap. xii. Our Lord continues,—"And that day come upon you unawares: for as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth." The church militant, it must be remembered, dwells on the face of the earth just as much as the world does. The point of the Saviour's words is the universality of the snare, i.e. it is not to be laid at a particular time to catch the world alone, as distinguished from the Church. It comes as a snare to all. It does not catch all. Surely in vain is the net spread *in the sight* of any bird. It is a snare in itself, in

Digitized by Google

the abstract; but not actually and practically to the wise, to whom an apostle writes, "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness (i.e. have your lamps lighted) that that day should overtake *you* as a thief." This consideration negatives the idea that at the time spoken of the church had been removed from the earth. Returning to Matthew's continuation of the discourse, we find that the parable of the virgins immediately follows the warning we have been considering. The *order* of the parable in the discourse is no doubt all important.

II. *The Time when the Simile will hold good.* "Then"—our previous remarks will, I think, have cleared away any difficulty here. "Then" is that day, the unknown moment of the descent into the air, of which the Son himself is content to be ignorant. It will be observed that the history of the virgins commences with the commencement of the tarrying of the bridegroom, i.e. from ascension day: it is only at the time of the coming that they are found to resemble "ten."

III. *The Meaning of the expression "Kingdom of Heaven."* The terms "Kingdom of Heaven" and "Kingdom of God," signify slightly different phases of the same thing, the difference being so slight that at times, e.g. in the parable of the sower, they are used interchangeably. The present dispensational aspect of the kingdom of heaven is that of treasure (the Church) hid in a field (the world). In the admirable words of General Goodwyn, "It is this condition of spiritual regeneration into the royal family of heaven, and attitude of expectation of being taken home to the Father's house previous to manifestation in the glory of the first-born, that constitutes the present dispensational aspect of the kingdom of God." In its millennial aspect, to quote the same writer whose words on this subject can scarcely be improved, the kingdom of heaven is that of the heavenly son of David, conducted on heavenly principles, for a heavenly object, by a heavenly body, from the heavenly city. And what is stated in the parable is, that at the transition moment, when the treasure is about to be taken from the field, that the righteous hidden no longer may shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father, the kingdom of heaven is found to resemble, not virgins particularly, for it had resembled virgins from the commencement of the tarrying of the bridegroom—but *ten* virgins.

IV. *Why the Kingdom of Heaven should be likened to Virgins.* As the kingdom of heaven, in its present phase, is not an outward and visible thing, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, which is possessed by the invisible church alone; so the virgins, who now compose this kingdom and church, are not mere professing Christians but believers, kept "unspotted from the world." As this has been already demonstrated in the RAINBOW, and is manifest from every part of the story of the ten virgins, I shall not further enlarge upon it here, suffice it to remark, that the simile is used by St. Paul with reference to his

Digitized by Google

Corinthian converts (2 Cor. xi. 2) of whom it can hardly be said as has been said of the foolish virgins that "as in some dead cattle, there is nothing good but their skin, so there is nothing good in hypocrites but their imitating outside." (Parable of the ten virgins opened and applied by Thos. Shepard, 1636.)

V. *And why to Ten Virgins.* The great majority of writers appear to consider that words and numbers, especially in the parables, are often used in Scripture in a vague and indefinite way, being merely put in, as it were, to complete the story, without having any particular meaning of their own; treating the Divine word somewhat as if it were a tale with a very good general moral, but without much instruction in its several parts. With respect to the use of the number in the literal circumstance for which the parable was taken, "the Jews never held a synagogue, circumcised, kept the passover, or *contracted marriage*, but ten persons at least were present," (see Ruth iv. 2,) and the number of the bridesmaids on these occasions seems generally to have been ten. But what is the significance of the number in the "Mystery" of the parable? Does it imply the Ten Tribes of Israel? These must always have resembled ten, whereas it is only at a particular moment that the kingdom of heaven was found to resemble ten virgins. As regards the Scriptural significance of particular numbers, e.g. "the Satanic six, the incomplete five," &c., though unable to say that these things are not so, I cannot at present see sufficient reason for accepting them as articles of belief. Who at this particular time found the kingdom of heaven to resemble ten virgins: the wicked? "None of the wicked shall understand." The unconverted nations constituting the sheep of Matt. xxv? "When saw they" Christ or the mysteries of the kingdom? The Jew? The veil is upon his heart and eyes at this time. It was the virgins themselves who discovered that in some way they resembled ten. We shall see in the subsequent portion of the parable the truths that they at different times received; but let me here illustrate their number by a parallel case, that of the seven churches in Asia, considered as representing the Church of Christ in seven phases or historical periods during the tarrying of the bridegroom. It will be at once observed that each of these churches practically represents a certain *number of years*; e.g. Ephesus may be called the period from the founding of the Christian Church to the first general persecution. Let us apply this principle to the case in point, the sign = signifying "is," or "is equivalent to," or "is found to resemble," as the case requires.

The Kingdom of Heaven (developed)		=	The Millennial Reign.
The Kingdom of Heaven	,,	=	Ten Virgins.
The Millennial Reign	,,	=	Ten Virgins.
The Millennial Reign	,,	=	Ten Centuries.
Ten Virgins	,,	=	Ten Centuries.

Digitized by Google

The Ten Virgins=	,,	= The Church Militant
	,,	= (when near its end)
The Church Militant (" then ")		= The Millennial Reign:

i.e. at the time in question, the church, having almost arrived at the end of its phase as the hidden treasure, finds (which it had never wholly done before) that it then resembles ten virgins, or is representative of and foreshadows the millennial reign, during the ten centuries of which the saints are to rule over the earth. A portion of the church, therefore, will continue to deny the doctrine of the pre-millennial advent down to about this period.

VI. *The Virgins' Lamps.* Without raising the question as to whether the virgins carried lamps or torches, we observe that (1.) All had lamps. (2.) Up to a certain moment all had lighted lamps. We find in Scripture the Word defined as a lamp. " Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." (Psa. cxix 105.) " The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light." (Prov. vi. 23.) All the virgins then, had lamps; all Christians have Bibles, but a Bible in itself is valueless. A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven, from the Father of lights.

VII. *The Going Forth to meet.* This alludes to a preliminary assemblage of the virgins, a going out of their homes and meeting together, which was the first step towards meeting the bridegroom. In other words, it signifies the individual members of the church (the ecclesia, i.e. assembly-summoned-out-of-the-world) emerging from the world in obedience to the command, " Come out from among them and be ye separate." (2 Cor. vi. 17.) This is an indispensable preliminary to meeting the bridegroom, and was therefore duly performed by all ten virgins. Mere professors never come out of the world at all; they only appear to do so.

VIII. *The Bridegroom.* Christ. (Matt. ix. 15; John iii. 29; 2 Cor. xi. 2.)

IX. *The Parabolic meaning of the term " Wise."* " Phronimos" (Lat. Prudens)=provident=possessing foresight=having discernment in a thing=knowing the signs of the times (see 1 Chron. xii. 32; Esther i. 13)=being acquainted with the period and circumstances of the second advent. " *Wisdom* excelleth *folly* as far as *light* excelleth *darkness.*" (Eccles. ii. 13.) This wisdom does not consist in the knowledge of the way of salvation, which is hid from them that are lost, or in being wise as is the Deity. Had either of these kinds of wisdom been intended, the word " sophos " would have been used. (See Rom. xvi. 27; Eph. v. 15.) It is the wisdom, i.e. prudence or forethought, of the serpent (not the *cunning* of the *old* serpent) recommended by our Lord. (Matt. x. 16.)

X. *The Parabolic meaning of the term " Foolish."* " Moros " (Lat. Fatuus)=dull=ignorant of the signs of the times=unacquainted with the period and circumstances of the second advent.

Digitized by Google

They might be correct in other doctrines e.g., they might hold justification by faith; but, as regards the second advent, they were dull and unprepared for it, and were consequently "left." (See Heb. ix. 28.) Mere professors are never called virgins, and will form no part of the Kingdom of Heaven. The good are often foolish, as was the Psalmist Asaph, "So foolish was I and *ignorant*, I was as a beast before thee." But was he on that account to be left to perish? No, his lamp was to be lighted for him by God. (Psa. xviii. 28.) "Thou shalt guide me by thy counsel, and," like the foolish virgins, "afterward (i.e., in their case, after they have suffered) receive me to glory."

XI. *The Parabolic meaning of the term "Oil."* This is no absolute Scriptural definition of the parabolic meaning of oil, but it is almost universally admitted to be in some way connected with the Holy Spirit. (See Zech. iv. 2-6; Apoc. iv. 5.) Now as a further supply of oil in an oil vessel was what the wise had, and the foolish had not, and as acquaintance with the period and circumstances of the second advent was what the wise had and the foolish had not; we must understand by the oil and the oil vessels, the influence of the Spirit in leading them into these truths. The vessel is to be considered as one in signification with the oil, inasmuch as, in the nature of things, a further supply of oil necessitated an oil vessel.

XII. *The Tarrying of the Bridegroom.* This constitutes "the patience of Jesus Christ" in "waiting for his throne," "through the long ages of a mediatorial priesthood." Whom the heaven must receive, until the time of the restitution of all things. The Christian and the Jew are alike waiting, the former, for "the Son from heaven" (1 Thes. i. 10): the latter, until the day when the lion of the Tribe of Judah shall rise up to the prey (Zeph. iii. 8). The tarrying continues from the ascension until the midnight cry.

XIII. *The Universal Sleep.* This continues during the Bridegroom's tarrying, i.e. from the ascension to the midnight cry. But, it was only at the conclusion of the tarrying, that the kingdom of heaven was found to resemble ten virgins: the slumberers and sleepers, therefore, were the invisible church in another phase than that of ten virgins. So, we are not to suppose that the wise virgins ever slept, because at the time of the sleep, the church is not compared to wise and foolish virgins at all. With respect to these sleepers from age to age, we remark, that some slumbered only and some slept, i.e. were totally indifferent to, and ignorant of, correct views on the second advent. (Compare the use of a similar word in 1 Cor. xi. 30.)

XIV. *Midnight.* The marriage being to take place at some hour of the night, according to eastern custom, the Jewish bridesmaids would not expect the coming of the bridegroom before the night; therefore midnight, or the conclusion of the second watch, which extended from 9 p.m. to 12, is the centre of a period the

Digitized by Google

first half of which begins when the wise virgins, as a body, begin to expect the bridegroom's coming. The wise virgins, as a body, have begun to look (more or less) for the bridegroom's coming; we, are, therefore, in the night, but necessarily have not yet reached midnight. Night was dispelled by the lighted lamps, the significance of which we have already considered. Night is, therefore, a time of ignorance, hesitation, and doubt, when we "see darkly." Midnight is when the perplexity of the church, a perplexity afterwards extended to the world (Luke xxi. 25), has reached its height. Night and midnight, therefore, are not connected with physical trouble of any kind. The slumbering and sleeping, though certainly in a less degree, continues from the commencement of night up to midnight.

XV. *The Midnight Cry.* We observe (1.) It is not said by whom the cry was made. (2.) It was addressed to the virgins, and to no one else. (3.) It was heard by them all. (4.) It warned them of the coming of the bridegroom; and (5) commanded them to go out to meet him. The cry of the angel in Apoc. xiv. 6 7, which the midnight cry of the parable has been stated to be, was neither addressed to these virgins, nor uttered at this time, nor was it to this effect. It appears to be condemnatory of the worship of the image of the beast; it is addressed to the world generally, and not until after the slaughter of the Gentile non-worshippers of the beast, i.e. the foolish virgins; for be it observed that even if some of the elect Jewish remnant are slain by the Antichrist, the whole of them are not (Zech. xiii. 9); whereas the non-worshippers of the beast mentioned in Apoc. xiii. are destroyed to a man. Thus a portion of the church must necessarily endure the tribulation. It would seem then, that this miraculous warning given to the whole church, by a being cognisant of the future, and using the language of command, must, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, be considered as given by the Holy Spirit; and in accordance with "the secresy and suddenness of divine visitations," as being given silently and in a moment, and probably taking the form of an irresistible influence on the spirit and belief. Thus God does not leave his servants ignorant of his intentions; like Noah and Lot, they have ample warning of judgment to come, though that does not prevent some of them, like Lot's wife, who is a striking prototype of the foolish virgins, from failing to escape. And, as at the moment of this warning, it is too late for the foolish virgins to escape the tribulation, the warning itself does not in the least prevent the coming from being as a snare and as a thief.

XVI. *The Arising of the Virgins.* The midnight cry is accepted by the entire church as the truth of God. The slumbering and sleeping which had continued from the Ascension to the beginning of the night, and from thence, though in a less degree, until midnight, is abruptly and for ever ended. Hence the arising—the getting up from the ground whereon they had previously lain, i.e.,

Digitized by Google

the sudden change from a state of comparative unconcern to one of the greatest anxiety. The virgins should never have lain down; St. Paul tells his Christian soldier to stand; but, like Peter, James, and John in the garden, their eyes were heavy.

XVII. *The Trimming of the Lamps.* Thus startlingly awakened, the whole church flew to the Word. Lord, to whom should we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. The coming of Christ so close at hand! It was almost impossible to realise the fact. The wise virgins who had expected it, and "understood all these things," though but dimly, are lifted above earth and its concerns in a solemn trance, tempered by the incomprehensible peace of God. This is none other than the gate of heaven. But alas for the foolish!

XVIII. *The Extinguishment of the Lamps of the Foolish Virgins.* Up to this moment the foolish virgins believed their lamps to be burning brightly, more brightly indeed than those of the wise. But now they find that their lamps are going out, that they cast no light upon the coming of the Bridegroom, which has been so recently announced; i.e. the religious knowledge of those who deny the pre-millennial advent and its attendant circumstances will suffice for them until the midnight cry. But then all will be confusion. In the opinion of the foolish virgins years were yet to elapse before the coming; the world had yet to be converted by the preaching of the Gospel. Numberless other imaginations and ideas perplex and distract them. Truly their lamps are going out. Though not riotous servants, yet, like the riotous servant, they had practically said, "My Lord delayeth his coming," and they have their reward. "There is treasure to be desired and oil in the dwelling of the wise; but a foolish man spendeth it up." (Prov. xxi. 20.)

XIX. *The Request for Oil.* But, can no ray of light be cast upon the dark and stormy sea of doubt and perplexity? Yes, there is a hope; wonderful to say, there are Christian friends around calm and peaceful, nay, more than this, supernaturally peaceful, already wrapt in the sunlight of the fast coming eternity of glory. They appear to understand all, and to rejoice with joy unspeakable. How is this? Explain the maze of mystery. Give us of your oil.

XX. *The Denial and its Reason.* The wise virgins do not give an express denial. Their reply, spoken more musingly to themselves than to the foolish, is, "perhaps it will not suffice for us and you," i.e., we cannot lead you in a moment into those truths you have for years rejected; perchance it is destined that our oil, sufficient for ourselves, should not suffice for you also." The wise already begin to recognise the tremendous law that, if found foolish at the moment of the midnight cry, it is impossible to become wise before the coming of the Bridegroom. The grief occasioned by the knowledge of the fate of their friends would, under ordinary

Digitized by Google

circumstances, be almost unendurable. But human feelings, such as these, are fast passing away, being swallowed up in the astonishing grandeur of the victory given through our Lord Jesus Christ.

XXI. *The Advice of the Wise Virgins.* They do not, however, by any means, abandon their unhappy friends, but give them all they can, good advice. And, it appears from the advice given, that oil could still be procured, though not before the coming of the bridegroom. But who are they who had oil to sell? God the Father, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift; God the Son, who, like the poor widow in the Gospel, threw into his Father's treasury even all that he had (Matt. xiii. 44), nay more, himself, to build that temple the church; God the Holy Ghost, who teaches the believer all things, bringing all things to his remembrance, leading him into all truth, and interceding for him with groanings which cannot be uttered. These have oil to sell; buy quickly.

XXII. *The late Purchase of Oil.* Neither reckless nor impenitent, the foolish virgins at once adopt the advice; they went to buy: yes, and actually procured oil. To the last they probably hoped that they should be in time to go in with the Bridegroom. That was impossible; but, hoping against hope, with lighted lamps they hasten back to the door. Though fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken, they understand it now.

XXIII. *The Coming of the Bridegroom.* This occurs during the interval of the absence of the foolish virgins. This is the great event for which the church is waiting, the unknown date, the day and hour of which it is impossible to fix. The Bridegroom comes to his cloud pavilion in the air, and there "receives to himself" the wise virgins, and those that sleep in Jesus, caught up to meet him, and changed in the twinkling of an eye. The prince of the power of the air, with all his principalities and powers, are shaken from their seats in the aerial regions by the descent of our Lord and the ascent of the sleepers in Jesus and the ready living saints, the wise men who scale the city of the mighty (Prov. xxi. 22), and who "escape all those things that shall come to pass," and stand before the Son of Man earlier than their brethren.

XXIV. *The Door.* Immediately on the entry of the wise virgins the door was shut, nor does it appear that it was ever again opened. The holy dead, it will be observed, are not mentioned in the parable (which only concerns the body of living saints existing at the end of the age), and are therefore not described as entering through the door. What then was the door? The expression must be understood (1) figuratively; (2) literally; or (3) literofiguratively, which last seems the correct interpretation; for—

1. The door was a physical fact. The wise virgins, both in the parable and in the reality, are to pass through it.

Digitized by Google

2. It was not a material *door*. For no such exists through which the ascending saints could pass.

There are various figurative doors mentioned in Scripture, e.g. the door of faith (Acts xiv. 27), of utterance (Col. iii. 3,) of opportunity of spreading (1 Cor. xvi. 9), or receiving (Apoc. iii. 8) Gospel truth. The door in question is plainly none of these; all these had been passed through before by all the virgins. It was not the Bridegroom, for the Bridegroom and the door are distinguished in the parable; and Christ is not the door of entrance into the heavenly regions, but the door of entrance into an eternal salvation (John x. 9), begun while the believer is still on earth in the body. The door in question, then, was the physical fact and non-material door by which the wise virgins, and they alone, entered the pavilion of the presence (Psa. xxxi. 20-21), i.e. the instantaneous change of body of the ready living saints. This is at once a physical fact and a non-material door. This door after the entry of the wise shuts never to be re-opened, as all the foolish virgins have to pass through the tribulation and *die a violent death*. (Apoc. xiii. 15; xvi. 6.) Finally, this door must not be confounded with that shut for ever on the impenitent Jews, the rebels (Ezek. xx. 38), the original "children of the kingdom." The answer given to these "workers of iniquity" widely differs from that given to the foolish virgins. (See Matt. viii. 10-12; Luke xiii. 25-30.)

XXV. *The Return of the Foolish Virgins.* After an interval, the duration of which it is impossible to fix, but which is probably short, the foolish virgins return with lighted lamps. It is evident that they had procured oil, for they had previously recognised the necessity of having lighted lamps in order to obtain admittance, and therefore would not have applied for admittance without having the indispensable passport. But, as we have seen, oil is equivalent to understanding the times, and we know that, at all events, until the coming of Christ to the earth, none of the wicked shall understand. (Dan. xii. 10.) "But the wise shall understand," and we see some of the wise understand before others. This, therefore, is one of the many incidental circumstances, which show that the foolish virgins are not part of the wicked. The first fact which on their return they instantly notice is the disappearance of their companions. It is the old story. *A prudent man foreseeth the evil and hideth himself; but the simple pass on and are punished.*

XXVI. *Their Application.* Hoping against hope, they exclaim "Open to us!" They do not say "open the door to us," thus negativing the idea of any material door or particular aperture; but "open" (ἄνοιξον), unfold, disclose thyself to us, thou God that hidest thyself, as thou hast done to our friends. But the glory of the instantaneous change is not for the unready: theirs is the wages of sin—death. They are saved, yet so as by fire. *Take*

Digitized by Google

away the dross from the silver, and there shall come forth a vessel for the finer.

XXVII. *The Bridegroom's Reply.* The despairing application of the foolish virgins was not unnoticed; they received an answer, but not such as they desired. This is continually the case with the prayers of God's people; he grants their requests in his own way. Mark the contrast between the reply of Christ to these virgins, and his reply to certain professors who ask for admittance into the kingdom on the ground of works. (Matt. vii. 21-23.) The answer these latter receive is not, "I know you not;" it is, "I *never* knew you! This is infinitely different and infinitely more dreadful than the answer given to the foolish virgins. To them the Bridegroom's reply is, "I know you not, I do not recognise you as applicants for admittance through a door for ever closed; I will know you in the ages to come." Terrible must be their disappointment. But whatever their temptations and trials may be, their strength will be equal to their day. Force will be unable to deprive them of the glory to follow. No created being can pluck them from the Father and the Son. Fraud will be equally impotent: it is imposible to deceive the elect, Jewish or Gentile. Though, at this period of the parable, the foolish virgins are "robbed householders," robbed of their hopes and of their friends, they shall at length, made perfect through suffering, and presented faultless, stand with robe and crown of victory upon the sea of glass *mingled with fire.* (Apoc. xv. 2-4.)

XXVIII. *The Moral of the Parable.* This is not "accept the Gospel," or, "be not a mere professor of religion." It is "Watch:" watch, be ready for the unknown day and hour, the day and hour of the coming of the Lord for his Gentile church. The caution is not given to Jews. The day and hour of the coming of the Lord to his elect Jewish remnant are known. (Zech. xiv. 4-7.) Faith and patience will easily be able to calculate it. The coming to the air is the unknown moment, for which, like the Christians of Thessalonica of old (1 Thess. i. 10), we are waiting. And though, as the years roll on, believers may at times feel that the blessed hope deferred maketh the heart sick; yet, when at length the Desire of all nations shall come, he will be found to be a tree of life, alike to the church (Col. iii. 3) and to the world.

ROBERT BROWN, JUN, F.S.A.

ON RETRIBUTION.

"Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another, . . . which the Lord would not pardon."

2 KINGS xxi. 16, and xxiv. 4.

OUR first exclamation on reading the above words is,—*and quite right.* Surely a God of justice, yea, even a God of the greatest

Digitized by Google

mercy,—and perhaps all the more because he was a God of mercy, —not only would not but *could not* pardon such wickedness. Let no man deceive himself with vain words,—all sin wilfully committed against God inevitably brings with it punishment and suffering. Even repentance itself, however deep and sincere, will not *entirely* do away with the punishment, though it will greatly soften it. Surely every one who honestly examines his own heart, can verify if he chooses the truth of this statement. We *never* escape the fitting and deserved punishment of sin wilfully committed; and a happy thing it is for us that we do not; for if God did really allow us to escape on such easy terms, we should soon cease either to worship or to love and reverence Him.

But though at the time we may fret and murmur against the retribution we suffer, and may fancy that God is too hard upon us; nevertheless afterwards we reap "the peaceable fruits of righteousness," and are enabled ourselves to confess, with loving gratitude, "Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now have I kept thy word."

I have long been convinced that wilful sin has to be *worked back*, as it were, in the case of every sinner; he has again, it would seem, to be subjected to a trial of a similar character to that under which he yielded, and to learn what the natural consequences of it are ere he can be restored. I do not say that the sinner is not *forgiven* on repentance, for true repentance at once ensures *that* in the sight of the Lord; but forgiveness by no means implies exemption from punishment, but rather in fact the reverse: "God chasteneth us for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness."

I would take, as one of the clearest instances of the above principle, the conduct of Joseph to his erring brethren. Through their absence of fraternal love, their envy and self-seeking, they had been guilty of gross cruelty and wickedness,—wickedness only just stopping short of *murder*. They had sold their brother into Egypt, and had thus, as they thought, ensured their own safety from their father's anger; and they received no punishment at the time except that of their own consciences. Years rolled on, and they had perhaps almost forgotten their misdoings; they had families and occupations of their own and no doubt went about their usual avocations, thinking little of the past. But the God of truth and justice had not forgotten it; he *could* not forget it, for in accordance with his moral attributes he *must* act in righteousness. At last, by what might appear an accident, retribution comes upon them. They had sold their brother into Egypt, and into Egypt they must go themselves; they had treated their brother as a slave, and now they themselves must be made to bow down with their faces to the earth before the very person whom they had so ill-treated; they had been selfish and envious, and now they themselves must be made, so to speak, to restore the moral equilibrium. And they seem themselves, in their hour of trial to recognise the

Digitized by Google

justice of their state, and to see that they were suffering for their cruelty committed so long ago. "We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us and we would not hear; therefore is this evil come upon us" (Gen. xlii. 21). By a noble act of self-sacrifice Judah redeems his character, and we may say *forces* Joseph to declare himself; thereby showing us that Joseph's object was not to *punish*, but to give his brethren an opportunity of proving their repentance.

Joseph is the true type of our Lord and Saviour, and the Spirit of God reveals to us, for our instruction and guidance, by him, the true principles of his own divine government.

Can it be said, can it be thought that Joseph was harsh and cruel in thus dealing with his brethren? Surely it was the very reverse; his deep emotion and tenderness are fully shown in the narrative itself, more especially where he is compelled by the violence of his pity to reveal himself. So far from being without pity he was only too full of it, and showed himself in all respects to be indeed their brother and their friend.

It would not have been right or proper in Joseph,—a man in whom we see pre-eminently the capacity for authority and power,—to allow his brethren to get off as it were scot-free, and without calling to remembrance their sin. Yet it was not to exact vengeance but to bring them to repentance that Joseph thus tried them. Though he was their brother, yet he here stands out in his true character as the *Firstborn*,—for we are told distinctly in 1 Chron. v. 2, that "the birthright was Joseph's,"—and he could scarcely now fail to see that God had invested him with that Royal Title, and that as such it became his *duty* to act in the truest sense both as a Ruler and a Friend. Indeed it seems almost a question whether his brethren had after all suffered sufficiently, for Joseph's parting words to them, as they went to fetch their father, "See that ye fall not out (*Sept.* 'quarrel') by the way," seemed to imply a doubt as to their future conduct.

"Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful." Rouchefoucault observes that "the truest test of friendship is not to reveal our faults to our friends, but to *show him of his own*." This is indeed fidelity rarely found in this world, but our true Elder Brother and best Friend never fails herein, notwithstanding the pain and sorrow it causes him so to do. If we find Joseph so deeply affected by the distress of his brethren, we have every reason to believe that our Lord is grieved in an infinitely greater degree.

A few other points come out in this history of Joseph which are not without their significance. First, we have Benjamin who was in no way implicated in his brethren's sin, obliged to share their anguish, and indeed to a certain extent he must have been more tried than they were, since he must have thought it a cruel fate when the cup was found in his sack, and that a life of bondage and

Digitized by Google

slavery was before him. Reuben also who had been so anxious to save Joseph is made to partake in their distress. These are of course cases in which the principle of *retribution*—properly so called—does not seem at first sight to apply *individually*, but it does apply when we consider that taken as a whole the family of Jacob had sinned and that therefore as a family must also suffer. We are not isolated individuals in this world, we are members of one great family, and there is a deep solemnity in the truth that "when one member suffers all the members suffer with it." But though this is true exoterically, so to speak, it does not affect what is really and properly retribution, for in the case both of Reuben and of Benjamin there was not the sting of conscience to accuse them as was the case with their brethren. The true curse of God against sin is the misery of the wounded conscience; a misery so great that to get rid of it men will sometimes, as we see, give themselves up to justice and confess their sin publicly. *This* is the true punishment of sin, whether temporal misery be attendant upon it or not; and *this*, as seems most probable, will be carried on in Hades in greatly increased force. If, as we have every reason to suppose, the next stage of existence is a continuance of this in the sense that "our works do follow us," it must be so if God is righteous and just; and let us remember that *there*, when the body is cast off, there will be nothing to distract or disturb the mind, or to prevent it from seeing in its true character the evil of sin and of disobedience to God's laws.

Let us take as another proof of this principle the words in Jeremiah ix. 9: "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

How was it possible, even to our limited understandings, that a righteous God *could* pass over with impunity such constant and terrible idolatry as that to which the Jews in the days of Jeremiah were addicted. In the chapter preceding the above (chap. viii.), the prophet, after enumerating the horrid cruelties of Moloch worship in which king and people had all more or less participated, says: "At that time they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of his princes, and the bones of the priests, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem out of their graves, and shall spread them out to the sun and the moon and all the hosts of heaven, which they have loved and which they have served." One's natural feeling of righteous indignation seems to approve cordially of such retribution. It is absolutely necessary and essentially right and proper that when sin has reached a certain point judgment should follow. If our Father in heaven "stretches His hand all the day to a disobedient and gainsaying people," there must come a time when such a people is left to eat of the fruit of their own devices. "He who being often reproved hardeneth his neck shall suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy." Mercy carried beyond a certain point becomes simply weakness,

Digitized by Google

but even punishment when properly inflicted is only mercy in another form.

All the prophets in their warnings and threatenings continually open the door for repentance, and show to king and people how heinous and how long-continued have been their sins. They seldom speak of isolated acts but of *habitual* transgression. Yet, let it be observed that throughout all their threatenings and warnings Jehovah speaks as a just and righteous Father as well as a King. He is neither tyrannical nor hard but acts precisely as a good human father on earth would act towards a rebellious child. How full of mercy and comfort are the words all the prophets are commissioned to speak when once the needful chastisement is inflicted, and the least germ of penitence appears!

Our Lord tells us that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repents than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance; and these words seem to me to be a conclusive proof that angels feel very much as good men on earth feel, viz., that the delight experienced on seeing a sinner truly repentant is so great as to swallow up every other. At first sight it might almost seem unreasonable, but our best and truest feelings approve it. This, among other passages, also proves to me that all our highest and holiest feelings go over with us into the next world, and compel us to believe that love (ἀγάπη) will not be less powerful there than it is here. But if so how could there be any possibility of peace or comfort for the saints if they knew that any one single fellow-creature was to be *eternally* tormented? Either death must completely change their whole moral being, or love and mercy mean different things in the next world to what they do in this.

Retribution, as its very name implies, signifies a rendering *back* to a man what he has himself done to others; but if a malefactor were to suffer much more than he had inflicted, it could not properly be called *retribution*. It has been said that "when our anger is too violent it sinks us beneath those we hate," and we all feel that this is absolutely true. "Anger *resteth* in the bosom of fools;" with God "His anger endureth but for a moment," but "His mercy endureth for ever."

In the case of Joseph we see faintly reflected the truth: "Not as the offence so also is the free gift." Compare Joseph's treatment of his brethren, with their treatment of him. *They* had sold him as a slave into Egypt, sent him away as it might seem for ever, from a home where he was deeply loved and cherished by his father, to a life of slavery and toil. *He*, on the other hand, contents himself with a short period of suspense and distress on their part, and only *threatens* to reduce Benjamin into slavery. He feeds them when hungry, sends them home loaded with food, and that "without money and without price," for he returns them all their money. It is true that he takes one of their number, Simeon, and binds

Digitized by Google

slavery was before him. Reuben also who had been so anxious to save Joseph is made to partake in their distress. These are of course cases in which the principle of *retribution*—properly so called—does not seem at first sight to apply *individually*, but it does apply when we consider that taken as a whole the family of Jacob had sinned and that therefore as a family must also suffer. We are not isolated individuals in this world, we are members of one great family, and there is a deep solemnity in the truth that "when one member suffers all the members suffer with it." But though this is true exoterically, so to speak, it does not affect what is really and properly retribution, for in the case both of Reuben and of Benjamin there was not the sting of conscience to accuse them as was the case with their brethren. The true curse of God against sin is the misery of the wounded conscience; a misery so great that to get rid of it men will sometimes, as we see, give themselves up to justice and confess their sin publicly. *This* is the true punishment of sin, whether temporal misery be attendant upon it or not; and *this*, as seems most probable, will be carried on in Hades in greatly increased force. If, as we have every reason to suppose, the next stage of existence is a continuance of this in the sense that "our works do follow us," it must be so if God is righteous and just; and let us remember that *there*, when the body is cast off, there will be nothing to distract or disturb the mind, or to prevent it from seeing in its true character the evil of sin and of disobedience to God's laws.

Let us take as another proof of this principle the words in Jeremiah ix. 9: "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

How was it possible, even to our limited understandings, that a righteous God *could* pass over with impunity such constant and terrible idolatry as that to which the Jews in the days of Jeremiah were addicted. In the chapter preceding the above (chap. viii.), the prophet, after enumerating the horrid cruelties of Moloch worship in which king and people had all more or less participated, says: "At that time they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of his princes, and the bones of the priests, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem out of their graves, and shall spread them out to the sun and the moon and all the hosts of heaven, which they have loved and which they have served." One's natural feeling of righteous indignation seems to approve cordially of such retribution. It is absolutely necessary and essentially right and proper that when sin has reached a certain point judgment should follow. If our Father in heaven "stretches His hand all the day to a disobedient and gainsaying people," there must come a time when such a people is left to eat of the fruit of their own devices. "He who being often reproved hardeneth his neck shall suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy." Mercy carried beyond a certain point becomes simply weakness,

Digitized by Google

but even punishment when properly inflicted is only mercy in another form.

All the prophets in their warnings and threatenings continually open the door for repentance, and show to king and people how heinous and how long-continued have been their sins. They seldom speak of isolated acts but of *habitual* transgression. Yet, let it be observed that throughout all their threatenings and warnings Jehovah speaks as a just and righteous Father as well as a King. He is neither tyrannical nor hard but acts precisely as a good human father on earth would act towards a rebellious child. How full of mercy and comfort are the words all the prophets are commissioned to speak when once the needful chastisement is inflicted, and the least germ of penitence appears!

Our Lord tells us that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repents than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance; and these words seem to me to be a conclusive proof that angels feel very much as good men on earth feel, viz., that the delight experienced on seeing a sinner truly repentant is so great as to swallow up every other. At first sight it might almost seem unreasonable, but our best and truest feelings approve it. This, among other passages, also proves to me that all our highest and holiest feelings go over with us into the next world, and compel us to believe that love (ἀγάπη) will not be less powerful there than it is here. But if so how could there be any possibility of peace or comfort for the saints if they knew that any one single fellow-creature was to be *eternally* tormented? Either death must completely change their whole moral being, or love and mercy mean different things in the next world to what they do in this.

Retribution, as its very name implies, signifies a rendering *back* to a man what he has himself done to others; but if a malefactor were to suffer much more than he had inflicted, it could not properly be called *retribution*. It has been said that "when our anger is too violent it sinks us beneath those we hate," and we all feel that this is absolutely true. "Anger *resteth* in the bosom of fools;" with God "His anger endureth but for a moment," but "His mercy endureth for ever."

In the case of Joseph we see faintly reflected the truth: "Not as the offence so also is the free gift." Compare Joseph's treatment of his brethren, with their treatment of him. *They* had sold him as a slave into Egypt, sent him away as it might seem for ever, from a home where he was deeply loved and cherished by his father, to a life of slavery and toil. *He*, on the other hand, contents himself with a short period of suspense and distress on their part, and only *threatens* to reduce Benjamin into slavery. He feeds them when hungry, sends them home loaded with food, and that "without money and without price," for he returns them all their money. It is true that he takes one of their number, Simeon, and binds

Digitized by Google

him before their eyes, but we have every reason to think that he did this because Simeon was the worst of them all. Jacob on his death-bed says, "Simeon and Levi* are brethren; instruments of cruelty are in their habitations." Finally he turns,—or rather God himself does so,—their very cruelty in selling him into Egypt into the means of blessing them all and saving them during the famine.

Take again, as a further illustration, the case of Ahab: Elijah had told him that "in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." Ahab on hearing these words humbled himself, and lay in sackcloth and went softly, and his partial repentance procured for him a great diminution of the curse, for although the words of the prophet were literally fulfilled, yet they were not so in the sense that Ahab feared; for he was wounded in battle as any other warrior might be, and the dogs licked up some of the blood that had fallen in the chariot, while the king himself died in his own house, and was buried in his own city Samaria.

Thus, then, we see how much less the retribution is than the original crime, but let it be observed that it is only so when accompanied with genuine repentance and sorrow for sin. Repentance has a wonderful power of *disarming* anger even in men of the world, and surely it has not less in the case of our Father in heaven. The principle of Law is the one that always comes *first*. One's *first* impulse on hearing of wrong-doing is indignation and a cry for just retribution, sometimes for too much of vengeance; but after time has been given to allay the righteous indignation thus excited, the feeling gives way to that of a desire to act justly in the matter, and finally, if we know the wrong-doer is suffering we begin to relent, and if repentance be begun in the heart of the offender we soon desire mercy and forgiveness to have their way. "Be ye angry," says the Apostle, "and sin not; let not the sun go down on your wrath;" i.e., be righteously indignant against sin but let not that indignation go further than is fit and right.

During the Athenian war the Mitylenians had revolted against Athens and been compelled to submit. The Athenians in great indignation at what they considered most unnatural rebellion, gave orders to their general that the Mitylenians should all be put to death and their wives and children sold into slavery, but the next day they began to repent and sent a trireme with all speed to countermand their cruel order, which trireme fortunately arrived in time,—for, we are told, the sailors and rowers worked with all their might and power in order to arrive as speedily as possible. On this occurrence Mr. Grote very truly observes, that in the very act of passing sentence, totally irrespective of the carrying out of that sentence, our wrath begins to evaporate. It is equally true that

* It may be remarked here that priests have been, in all ages, wonderfully like their elder brother Levi, in this respect.

Digitized by Google

confession of a fault has a wonderful power of disarming wrath, and if we really believe a wrong-doer is sincerely penitent it is next to impossible to be long angry with him.

Now the Scriptures lead us to believe that God is not as it were below but infinitely above us in this respect, and the prophets show us how marvellously like a good father the Almighty acts. Compare for instance the beautiful passage in Jeremiah xxxi. 19, "Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still; therefore my bowels are troubled for him: I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord."

Precisely, then, as a good human father would relent when he saw his child suffering, so is it with God. The history of the Jewish nation is a proof that this is so; for always on the least appearance of repentance did God raise them up deliverance from their enemies Nor, even now, is the present condition of that people any proof to the contrary, for in spite of all their long-continued sins they are not cast off altogether, and when they have been "provoked to envy by a foolish nation" they will be restored.

Now with respect to future retribution, we have no reason whatever to suppose that God will in any way depart from those *principles* of moral government which we see prevailing here. On the contrary, there is the strongest reason to believe,—as even J. S. Mill considered to be most probable,—that our life hereafter, both in Hades and in the new earth, will be very much a *continuation* of this present life. The body it is true will no longer be a source of trial and trouble to us, but the spirit will be treated upon the same *general principles* as was the case in the body. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; and consequently his character cannot alter. As therefore we are justified in this world in assuming that given a certain character, certain acts are sure to follow in the case of a man, so are we fully justified in supposing that the merciful kindness of the Saviour will *always* exist and *must* exist in Him unaltered. As bearing on this point I may quote, from that most interesting book, the "Life of Travers Madge," the following remark: "It is this very attribute of the unchangeableness of God that should lead one in the midst of great darkness to entertain at least a faint hope that the door of mercy which has been opened ever since sin entered into the world and death by sin, will never more be closed." * T. W.

PARAPHRASED PROPHECIES.

II.—DANIEL'S VISION OF THE FOUR BEASTS OF THE GREAT SEA.

Daniel vii.

[A very prevalent mode of interpreting the prophecy of the Four Beasts of Daniel vii. is to make them correspond to the metals of the

Digitized by Google

Great Image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, although forty-eight years had elapsed between the dates of the two visions. The former distinctly shows *five* separate phases of world-power successional to one another, as indicated in the first of these Paraphrases (RAINBOW, vol. xiii. p. 541), in contrast to *four* in the latter. No intimation is contained in text or context of the slightest connection between the two series of symbols, except the special feature common to the fourth, or iron kingdom, and the fourth beast; but this apparent similarity of characteristic may probably be one of degree only, the breaking and bruising power exercised by the one being intensified in form and action in the career of the other. Beside, Nebuchadnezzar had been dead two years when this vision of beasts was given to Daniel, and all the four beasts are spoken of (ver. 17) as future; thus the Babylonian kingdom could not be one of the dominions here symbolised. The facts that (1) the Beasts are represented to be contemporaneous in their overthrow if not in their beginning; and that (2) they are found to be existent up to the very time of the coming of the Son of Man, and the establishment of his universal and everlasting kingdom, make it exceedingly probable that the whole vision has reference to the great strifes and commotions that will happen in the age of the clay-iron feet and toes, just before the Second Advent, and which may have their beginnings in the very times in which we live. It is on the basis of this probability that the following paraphrase is founded; and it is also because of this probability that this vision is rendered more in the form of a synopsis than in that of an interpretative paraphrase.]

DANIEL spake and said: I saw in my vision the four winds* of heaven striving upon the Mediterranean Sea; and four great beasts arose.

1. The first was like a lion with eagle's wings; and I saw the wings wherewith it lifted itself on high plucked; and it was made to stand upon the earth as a man, and a man's heart was given to it.

2. And the second beast was like to a bear, and it raised up a dominion; and between its teeth three ribs were in its mouth; and unto it was said, Arise, devour much flesh.

3. After this I saw another beast, like a leopard, which had four wings of a fowl [bird] upon its back; it had also four heads; and to this beast dominion was given.

4. After this in my vision I saw a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and exceedingly strong; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it, having great teeth of iron and nails of brass. It devoured the whole earth (swallowed up or absorbed all other dominions), brake it in pieces, and trod it down with great oppressions. And it had ten horns or kings exercising authority under and with the beast. But a little horn arose among them, which subdued three of the ten horns and plucked them up by the roots.

And behold, this horn had eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things, and his look was more stout than his fellows, and

* Spirits, Zch. vi. 5.

Digitized by Google

the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, wearing them out.

And he spoke great words against the Most High, and thought to change times and laws, and they were given into his hand for three-years-and-a-half.

Then the Ancient of Days sat in judgment. His garments were white as snow; the hair of his head was like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him. And the books were opened.

And behold the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven which brought him near before the Ancient of Days; and the kingdom and the glory and the dominion were given to him, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him.

Then I beheld the thrones of these kings cast down, and the dominions of these great beasts taken away, to be consumed and destroyed to the end thereof. And I saw that the fourth beast was *slain*, and his *body* destroyed and given to the burning flame, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake. (But the *horn* himself was cast *alive* into the burning flame. Rev. xix. 20.) As concerning the rest of the beasts whose dominion had been taken away, their lives were prolonged for a season and a year.

5. Then the saints of the Most High took the kingdom to possess it for ever, even for ever and ever: and judgment was given to them. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, was given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. G. B. C.

[NOTE.—The application of this great prophecy of four beasts to the ancient monarchies has always appeared to me to be lame and unsatisfactory in every respect;—if for no other reason, because of this, that it requires the prolongation of the existence of the Roman dominion from the days of the Cæsars down to the date of the Second Advent. Now there is no more patent and stubborn fact in all history than the "decline and fall" of the old Roman power, and the utter end of the dominion so designated. As to the various modern imitations of that great tyranny, they have been notorious failures. The Pope was never a true successor of the Cæsars, certainly not now; the Franco-Germanic and Teutonic Empires, notwithstanding all their assumptions, never possessed the compact force, or exercised the dominant authority always found in connection with the Roman Empire, until destroyed by barbarian irruptions. What more thorough and decisive refutation of what may be called the "Roman earth" theory can be imagined? Hence there is ample room and clear for the supposition that this important vision of the Prophet Daniel refers to the rise in the latter days of several great kingdoms in the neighbourhood of the Great or Mediterranean Sea, one of which would become the seat of Satan's right-hand man, THE ANTICHRIST. Whether any of the four symbolic beasts have appeared; whether any of the peculiar characteristics attributed to them

Digitized by Google

are discoverable in past, or present, or inchoate states on the shores of the Middle Sea, are questions that cannot yet receive precise answers. Some might find the first beast "like a *lion* with *eagle's* wings," in the name and standards of the first Napo*leon*, whose *eagles* were so long the forerunners of victory wherever they appeared, and imagination would easily find the other characteristics in his extraordinary career: but coincidences of this nature are too numerous in the history of nations to be accepted as tests of the fulfilment of prophecy.]

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE RATIONALE OF THE DOCTRINE.

PART II.

Current Theories and their Difficulties (continued).

THE reader whose interest in the subject may have impelled him, and whose patience enabled him, to peruse our former paper, will probably remember, that of the four current theories of the great Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead which we therein enumerated, namely: (1) the *literal-identity* theory; (2) the *germ-survival* theory; (3) the *re-incarnation* theory; (4) the *spiritual-body* theory; we then, with some care, examined the two former; the result of our investigations being, that we were compelled,—we trust in no spirit of either Papal or Protestant infallibility,—to reject them both as not only not proven but in point of fact impossible. It remains for us, on the present occasion, to complete our review by a brief consideration of the third and fourth of the theories mentioned, leaving ourselves and our readers, in case of an unfavourable conclusion in these instances also, without any theory at all; unless we can either suggest a new one, or discover in those theories which singly and in themselves fail to satisfy us, *the dissociated elements* out of which one may be constructed which shall better commend itself to thoughtful Christian minds.

III. *The Re-Incarnation Theory.* Compromise in theology, as in other matters, not unfrequently precedes surrender. As it stands related to the more literal, and—as regards the letter at least,—more Scriptural *literal-identity* theory, the *germ-survival* doctrine was, as we have seen, a compromise; but like most compromises it failed to satisfy either party; it gave up too much for the literalist, it did not give up enough for the illusionist; hence, though still held by many intelligent but unscientific theologians, it has by those who have examined it most carefully, been in turn rejected; and—by some at least—a new theory of bodily resurrection adopted which, under a thin disguise, is nothing less than the absolute surrender of the doctrine of the resurrection as it had always hitherto, among orthodox Christians and Jews, been conceived of. Accepting the conclusion forced upon them by science and experience, that the material body which moulders in the grave, or is consumed in the fire, or is eaten by cannibals, perishes for ever; that we have cast it

Digitized by Google

off as completely and finally as a deserted dwelling or a worn-out garment: the upholders of this theory maintain that in resurrection the soul will by the Divine power be reinvested with a material human body *altogether new*, and perfectly adapted to its new sphere and conditions, but which will nevertheless practically be the same body inasmuch as it will be indwelt by, and united to, the same soul and spirit; and it is furthermore contended that this idea is in perfect accord with Paul's statement of the doctrine of resurrection: "Thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but *God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him*, and to every seed its own body" (1 Cor. xv. 37, 38).

Foremost, though not first,* among the upholders of this which we have called the *re-incarnation* theory, was the late Archbishop Whately, who in his celebrated book, "*A View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State*," thus expresses and illustrates it: "With respect to the *sameness of our bodies* (in life and resurrection), it seems clear enough, that a man's body is called *his*, from its union with his soul, and the mutual influence of the one on the other. Any one of his limbs he calls a part of his body, or part of himself, on account of its connection with the rest of the body, and with the mind. If the limb were cut off, he would no longer call it, properly, a part of his body; but would say, that it *was* so, and is, no longer. And his whole body is considered as the same, and as his, from year to year, not from its consisting of the same particles of matter (which it does not), but from its belonging to the same soul,—and conveying feelings and perceptions to the same mind,—and obeying the directions of the same will. So that if, at the resurrection, we are clothed with bodies which we, in this way, perceive to belong to us, and to be ours, it signifies nothing of what particles of bodily substance they are composed." He adds: "If men would apply on these subjects the same principles of common sense with which they judge of many of the affairs of human life, they would escape many difficulties, and find that there is no necessity, in such a case as this, for holding a doctrine open to powerful objections. If any one's house, for instance, were destroyed, and another man promised to rebuild it for him, he would not be considered as failing in his promise because he did not put together all the former materials. If the materials were equally good, and if the man were put in possession of a house not less commodious and beautiful than he had before, *that* would be to all practical purposes sufficient. It would be thought idle cavilling to contend that this was not, strictly speaking, a rebuilding of the *same* house, but the building of a different one; because the materials were new; and that therefore the promise was not fulfilled. No one would attend to such a frivolous distinction, when all practical purposes were completely answered. And the promise would be much *more* than fulfilled, if the materials were tenfold more durable—the building tenfold more beautiful and commodious than the former one."†

To the same purpose, though in more abstract and philosophic terms,

---

* His work referred to in the text was, if we remember rightly, preceded by Dr. Burton's Lectures.

† Eighth Edition, pp. 122—124.

Digitized by Google

the distinguished Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, Canon Westcott, in his "*Gospel of the Resurrection*," writes: "We cannot understand by body simply a particular aggregation of matter, but an aggregation of matter *as representing in one form the action of a particular law, or rather the realisation of a special formula.* The specific law or formula of assimilation and combination is that which is really essential and permanent. The same material elements may enter into a thousand bodies, but the law of each body, as explained above, gives to it that which is peculiar to, and characteristic of it. . . . With regard to man, there is nothing unnatural in supposing that the power which preserves his personality, by acting according to the individual law of his being in moulding the continuous changes of his present material body, and all that depends upon it, will preserve his personality hereafter *by still acting according to the same law in moulding the new element (so to speak) out of which a future body may be fashioned.* In other words, we can understand how the law which now rules the formation of our body may find its realisation hereafter in some other element, while the new body will be essentially the same as the old one, as expressing the corresponding action of the same law in relation to the new sphere in which it may be supposed to be placed."*

The same view is similarly expressed by Professor Perowne, in his little known but exceedingly valuable Hulsean Lectures on "*Immortality*." "We maintain," he says, "that the same body which has been laid in the grave may be raised at the last day, though not one single material particle, which went to constitute the one body, shall be found in the other. For what is it that is necessary to the identity of the body? The identity of the body does not depend on the identity of the material particles of which it is composed. These are in a state of perpetual flux. . . . The only thing of which we need to be assured is, that the principle of identity which governs the formation of the body in this life, shall govern its formation at the resurrection."†

These are unquestionably weighty statements which, as we shall hereafter point out, embody—especially those of Professors Westcott and Perowne—very important truth; but as more simply stated by Archbishop Whately, the theory, as such, appears to us to lie open to most serious objections.

(1.) In the first place, we must demur to the fairness of the Archbishop's illustration. A house is not a part of ourselves, not a thing, *per se*, with which we have any personal relations; and taking a purely utilitarian view of the matter, the better house would no doubt more than compensate us for the one destroyed. But let us alter the illustration a little; suppose the house in question is one in which we have lived for many years, or in which we were born, about which the happy associations of our childhood linger, and which has been the seat of our family for many generations; which is, in a word, saturated with our personality. Now if *this* house were destroyed, and in place of it a new, and if you will more commodious and beautiful one "rebuilt" for us,—Would this newly erected abode either "strictly speaking" or "to all

* Third Edition, p. 144. *Italics ours.*

† Pp. 110-116.

Digitized by Google

practical purposes" be to us the old house we had lost? Would *it* be the home of our childhood—the ancestral seat? Shall it be called "a frivolous distinction," an "idle cavil," if we indignantly deny that it is so? Surely not; you may have given me *another* house, you may even have built it on precisely the same plan, and of exactly the same size; but it is not *my* house—my old beloved home. It lacks the consecration of memory, its walls know not the voiceless speech that appealed so eloquently to my soul; its doors open not on the solemn past: I cannot say, "This was the bridal chamber; and there, in yonder room, the mother, whose recollection is an inspiration, lay in her last long sleep."

And so of our body; Scripture does indeed speak of it as "a tent" and "a garment" (2 Cor. v. 1-6), and so it is; but it is at the same time much more. We are "*at home* in the body;" in it we have sinned and suffered, in it, too, we would be sinless and glorified; it has been the instrument of Satan's malice, shall it not also be the monument of Christ's redeeming grace? We cannot give up Job's hope that "Our eyes shall behold *the great Redeemer*, and NOT ANOTHER:" nor must we forget that this body of ours, even in its mortality and humiliation, is "the temple of the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. vi. 19). The Transfiguration is to us a sufficient attestation that man's body was not intended by the Creator to be destroyed any more than his spirit,* and if when once it has become "the temple of God" it should utterly and for ever perish, this would be nothing less than the triumph of the power of evil over the Spirit of God.

(2.) Hence, as we might even antecedently have expected, we find very plainly that the promise of resurrection in the Scriptures, is not simply one of re-incarnation, but of the raising of *our own* bodies,—those bodies in which we pass through death. We build no argument upon the Greek word *ἀνάστασις*,—which simply signifies the act of "*rising up*" without the additional idea of "*again*,"—but that in some true and definite sense the same body which we now possess shall stand up or be raised hereafter, it is difficult to understand how any believer in revelation can for a moment doubt. Let the following explicit statements—among others—be fairly considered:—

John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54. "This is the will of him that sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raiseit up again at the last day. For this is the will of my Father, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day. . . . No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day. . . . Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

1 Thess. v. 3. "May your spirit and soul and *body* be preserved whole without blame in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Phil. iii. 20, 21. "For our country is in the heavens; from whence also we look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall *change* (*μετασχηματίζω* not *ἀλλάσσω*) *the body of our humiliation*, (that it may be) conformed unto the body of his glory." (*Alford.*)

---

* See RAINBOW, October 1875.

Digitized by Google

Rom. viii. 11. "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall *quicken even your mortal bodies* by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

We quote these passages simply to show that, according to Scripture, that which dies, which is sown, in the true sense—whatever that may be—*our own body*, and not some body not yet in existence, will be the subject of the *egiro* at the last day: that it is nothing less than an evasion of plain language to say that it means no more than this,—that losing our present material body at death, we shall receive another and perfectly distinct material body at the resurrection. No sophistry can prove that this *new* body will be *the same body*, for we have in such a case not a *resurrection* in any true sense, but to all intents and purposes a new *creation*. If this be all, then our birth into this world might as correctly be called a resurrection as our entrance into Christ's Millennial Kingdom, since in both cases alike we receive a body *which we never before possessed*.

(3.) Even in that one respect in which its advantage over the theories previously considered may seem at first sight most incontrovertible,—we mean its exemption from *scientific* objection,—this re-incarnation theory will be found, on examination, utterly to break down. The scientific argument against it is as powerful as the scriptural and the logical. True, indeed, it evades certain difficulties arising from the established laws of matter and force, of physiology and evolution; but only to come into direct collision with another of the grand generalisations of modern science,—we mean the law of *Continuity*. Almost a truism when once its meaning has been fairly grasped, this great principle, this inviolable law of nature, which has thrown so wondrous a flood of light on many problems heretofore regarded as practically unsolvable, is in fact our only reliable guide in all inquiries into either the past or the future; our only ground of assurance that if the sun rises to-morrow morning it will emit light and not sound. In the striking words of the authors of *The Unseen Universe*,—"Assuming the existence of a supreme Governor of the universe, the principle of Continuity may be said to be the definite expression in words of our trust that He will not put us to permanent intellectual confusion." According to this law of continuity, then, "no phenomenon can happen without naturally flowing from a cause immediately antecedent to it; that in passing from one state to any other, a body must pass through all intervening states; that there can be no sudden break without an orderly connection between an event and a preceding one." For a corn of wheat planted in the earth to germinate and grow up, "first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear;" this is according to the law of continuity; had we the time and the ability we could trace every step of the process, and see that each step followed the preceding one as its inevitable result. But suppose that this corn of wheat were planted to-day in a field in Kent, where it underwent the usual process of decomposition, and that a century hence, without any removal of the dust, a stalk of wheat springs up on the plains of Hindostan, and we should be called upon to believe that it was the product of the seed dropped in the soil of the English county, could we—ought we—to believe it? No; and the reason is because there would be in this case a complete solution of continuity. In like manner,

Digitized by Google

if it be admitted that in death our natural body perishes utterly, that it disappears as such for a time from God's universe, but that at the resurrection a new spiritual body will be given us, which body will nevertheless be *our own* body—the *same body* which we possessed in this life; we are constrained to say, "Nay, that is impossible; on no authority could we believe it; the conception of it is barred as by a wall of granite; for here again there is obviously a complete solution of continuity.

But to dwell further on this would, we feel, be to "slay the slain;" this theory must unquestionably, like those previously considered, be dismissed as untenable. We turn, therefore, to the last of the four current theories we proposed to examine.

Florence Villa, North Finchley. * W. MAUDE.

(*To be continued.*)

THE DEATH OF THE BODY NOT THE EXTINCTION OF THE SOUL.

PART II.

AND now let us endeavour to weigh the counter-reasonings of Mr. Mill. He tells us that the spirit being a constituent element of man's being gives no proof of his life being preserved through death. We think that it affords an irrefragable proof of it. For the Scripture says, that when a man dies, his "spirit returns unto God." If one part of man, therefore, perishes in dust; another, henceforth, according to our opponent's oft-quoted Scripture, as certainly lives in or with God. It is as true that the spirit is alive with God, as that the dust is dead in its kindred dust.

Job xxxiii. 4, and xxxiv. 14, are quoted as one passage. In the latter, Elihu speaks of God's gathering "unto himself his Spirit and his breath." But neither this, nor Eccles. xii. 7, need mean, and we are very well assured that they do not mean, that the Divine Being then re-absorbs into his own substance those portions of his Spirit and his breath that he had lent temporarily in dispersion to myriad millions of men. This doctrine of Pantheism we wholly decline to accept as in any wise true. Nevertheless, if it were—as my opponent seems distinctly to hold—the spirit that was man's still lives, it does not die, it survives yet in the essence of God. For "the fair inference" from Eccles. xii. 7, is thought to be that as the body of man returns to the dust "as it was," so the spirit of man returns to the divine substance as it was. It was certainly living "before it was given to the 'organised body of clay,'" and therefore it cannot fail to continue so after "its return to its original source." But the effect that Elihu asserts to follow is that "all flesh shall perish together,"—which is not to say that all soul-life shall likewise perish together. On God's withdrawing his breath of life from man, on his recalling from man his spirit of life, we know full well that all flesh-nature thereupon dies and perishes: yet this touches not the question of the soul's extinction with the body's dissolution.

Digitized by Google

That the final clause, "Man shall return again to dust," "accords alike with the account of his formation, and his threatened doom," and with all human observation and experience, we fully grant. But then the language is evidently synecdochical; it is manifestly an instance in which "the matter or form is put for the whole being" (Brand's Dictionary). It is only the man "who was formed of dust," the man as he was before "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," that "returns to the dust," that returns "to the earth as it was." The dust does not comprise the living soul, even when it is animated by it. And it is only when the spirit has been given up, and the soul has departed (see Gen. xxxv. 18), that the material body returns to *its* native dust.

Well, Mr. Mill has not challenged the postulate that man's spirit is a constituent element of man's being; nor has he affirmed that his spirit dies or becomes extinct when his body perishes. Consequently it remains unproven that man, in every part of his being, becomes wholly extinct at the first death. Nay, the spirit admittedly survives. And if his spirit, why not his soul, for all the force of the argument founded on the totality of the first death, which is THE argument involved in the question, "Are the dead alive?"

I may remove Mr. Mill's difficulty about the "many 'living entities'" supposed to result from "the death of one person," by saying that I do not believe in the separation of what survives of man at death into any such distinct entities. I believe rather in the continued junction of man's soul and spirit. And that the disembodied man should be a man renewed in spirit does not at all imply that he has two spirits. This irony will be ineffectual to convince that man's soul and spirit *are not* after the body dies.

Objection is made to the regarding sleep, in 1 Thess. iv. 13-17, and v. 10, as referring to "a qualified state of death;" it is said to be opposed to being awake, in the bare sense of being alive (i.e., in body—for no other life is allowed),—notwithstanding that the apostle, in the clause intervening, opposes sleeping to watching. Now, true though it be that we sin grievously if we wilfully suffer our moral sense to fall asleep. because it is more or less in our power to prevent this; that does not hinder the fitness of the Apostle's implied allusion to the watchful attitude of the saints who shall survive in body till the Lord shall come. Mr. Mill himself contends for the minimum of resemblance between a figure and the fact to which it has relation. That wakefulness should express life with especial reference to watchfulness in life, is not surely a very strained idea; and certainly it is not refuted by the fact that some cannot so watch, because they have previously ceased so to live. If the parallel be not perfect between moral and physical wakefulness, in that the one may be optional, and the other not; it need not be so, Mr. Mill being witness. Watchfulness, rather than life, predominates in the idea of wakefulness. When we ordinarily speak of a person as being awake, no one understands us to mean that he is alive, but we are often understood as indicating that the person so spoken of is on the look out, on his watch.

And my opponent agrees with me that "being awake" meaning "more than the mere fact of being alive," "the antithetical word (sleep), is used

Digitized by Google

in similar relation." And this can only mean that death signifies more than being dead; for he rejects as "strange" the notion that it can mean less than being dead. And is not this assenting to my position, that the Apostle by "sleep" does not mean death pure and simple, total, unrelieved, "unqualified" death? If sleep mean more than death, it must pass over the idea of extinction, and get through into the region of life again. I did not contrast sleep as meaning "less than to be really dead," with to "wake" as meaning "more than merely to live." My contrast was of an attitude of life with an absence of that attitude in death. I take the point of the Apostle to be that though those "sleeping through Jesus" be deprived of all ability to watch in the flesh for his coming again, they shall nevertheless not be overlooked, but shall be roused first, before those living in the body shall be changed. I reject, therefore, the "conclusion that those asleep are neither possessed of physical nor spiritual life." Though the spiritual life be manifested through the physical, so long as that subsists, it by no means follows that the extinction of the physical is equally the extinction of the spiritual.

Mr. Mill grants that "a man may be morally asleep whilst he is physically awake," and he thereupon makes the inquiry, "But does it follow that he may be morally awake, whilst he is physically asleep? or, that he may be morally alive, whilst he is physically dead?" I answer, No, in so far as the moral faculties are a part of the physical man. I am sorry for Mr. Mill's confusion anent "'the moral man' being 'man but in part,'" for I sought to make all plain. A man's life, in a moral relation, is a man's character; and a man's character may be in part moral, and in part immoral, so that he can "be both moral and immoral at the same time." Though "morality and immorality are not constituent parts of a man," his moral faculties are.

It is not for me to say whether my argument is strong and clear against Mr. Mill's "reasoning as conflicting with Paul's statement regarding life and death:" but this I am bound to say, that it was honestly put, and so far as my light yet goes, I am still satisfied with it. Mr. Mill objects (and does not object) to the use of such a term as "total human annihilation" as expressive of his doctrine. I admit my inaccuracy in applying it. For it is obvious that the dust of poor humanity remains, as well as the spirit reabsorbed in God; whilst the soul, which I hold to be the central self of man, is alone annihilate. And yet it seems to me that man, as man, is really in Mr. Mill's view annihilated at death; which probably accounts for his not objecting to the term, though he objects to its being used as his.

The question is proposed, "In what particular aspect is the metaphor (of sleep) to be looked upon as agreeing with the thing signified?" And whilst no direct answer is supplied to this query—or an answer that is tantamount to saying, "in no particular aspect"—the argument is given in reply, that "a figure or metaphor is neither unnatural nor strained—even although there should only be an apparent agreement on one point." This strikes me as a very odd account to give of a figure and its application. "A figure or simile may be compared," it is said, "to a ball on a plain." Then, as "it always touches at one point," "however far removed some portions of the ball may be from the plain," there is a

Digitized by Google

true, natural, unstrained metaphor, figure, or simile. I cannot see how this is to be interpreted otherwise than to mean that the ball is the figure of the plain on which it rests, because it touches it at one point. I never so conceived of a figure before. I should have thought the ball as unlike the plain in figure, as unfit to represent it in simile, or to be ideally substituted for it to help the conception of it, as any form at all could be. Then, of course, if a solid touching a solid at one point constitutes the one an appropriate figure of the other, much more may a fiction touching a fact at a single point make the fiction a figure of the fact.

We are further instructed of the relation of figure to fact that "it need not even be the primary idea which we attach to (the figure) in which the thing figured agrees." Thus I am really set to wonder what Mr. Mill's notion of a figure is: and to marvel that "a beautiful picture" should, in this case, be represented in and transmitted from a mere "point" to a mere point. And we must inquire, how we may determine what that point where the figure, being brought in contact with the fact, illustrates it? I had thought that an ideal figure must present to the imagination a full and correct outline representation of the reality designed to be suggested, whilst all licence may be allowed in the filling in of detail: but the main features of the figure, all that is important in its form, must agree, must accurately coincide, with the object figured. Otherwise the employment of figure would, in fact, be perfectly useless. If the resemblance be reduced to a mere point of contact, and that too of arbitrary selection, then can "the metaphor be looked upon" in no "particular aspect as agreeing with the thing signified."

Now, if we contemplate one in sound, placid, still sleep, what impresses us as most characteristic in the condition of the sleeper? Do we think instinctively, "Ah! what freshness of life, what restored energy, what renewed vigour for active duty, will be developed when this sleeper awakes?" Or, are we not rather struck with the present passivity of the sleeping one, with a sense of his total though temporary severance from the activities of life? The latter sentiment would be the natural one. But that the sleeper, though relatively, is not absolutely bereft of all sensation and consciousness would not at all strike us as a feature of that condition. Indeed, notwithstanding my opponent's remarks, we know that persons in sleep often give token both of sensation and consciousness, though they have not the faintest knowledge or recollection of it when they awake: a sufficient reply to the argument founded upon the silence of Lazarus and others respecting their experiences in Hades when they had been roused from death. Nay, some have walked, conversed, even written with the most perfect coherence in their sleeping hours, surpassing their own best efforts when awake. And, on the other hand, a person may be fully awake, and yet quite unconscious of the lapse of time by reason of the close occupation of his mind with some other subject. And, as one may be conscious in sleep, without being conscious that he is asleep, so likewise one may be conscious in death, "without being quite conscious that he is dead!"—a predication I never made; though I know of no evidence to the contrary.

That "death repairs no waste, renews no spent faculty, restores no exhausted power," is a bold assertion needing proof. Our Lord's simile (and Paul's is like unto it) of the grain dying, and so bringing forth

Digitized by Google

much fruit, teaches the contrary truth. And this, though it may not be a main feature of death, as death (and so of sleep), is yet very and unspeakably blessed, and, in the case of the saved, its primary result. We confide that man in resurrection will come forth magnificently renewed, and clothed in henceforth exhaustless power.

But, lo! the analogy extends deeper. Even in sleep man's dominant faculty is dead. It is to all appearance extinct: and yet we know that it is but latent. His will, in complete abeyance while he sleeps, comes forth strong and energetic in the morning. And so, though we may perceive no traces of its continued existence, may the soul of man, that central essence of his being, remain, we know not how, in death, through death, thence coming forth at the call of the mighty Resurrector.

After all, Mr. Mill has failed to indicate in what particular aspect sleep portrays death, unless it be in unconsciousness, an arbitrarily selected point, and one which he cannot verify.

I ought not again to be called upon to rebut the implied assertion that I do not believe in the death of man when he first dies. I do believe in that death, but I am sure that it does not extend to the soul of man, until God inflicts it thereupon, as he alone is able. "My flesh shall rest in hope." "The righteous hath hope in his death,"—when in the act of dying: and so in the former case. I have already said that the consciousness of rest depends upon the nature of the subject. The soul's not being left in Hades is a clear proof of its previous sojourn there, as distinguished from the corruption of the flesh in the grave. "'The ways of life' which the Scriptures make known," though they "are not in death, nor in Hades," are yet through Hades and through Death.

Mr. Mill does well to evade my simple argument in favour of the perpetuity of the regenerated life of the believer; whilst he still forgets that my original thesis was, "the physical death of the saints, not the extinction of their life and being." So that the argument which he deems an incumbrance has a really direct and close bearing on the very question discussed.

"Paul's words, 'I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him,'" were uttered in immediate prospect of his body's demise; whilst the assurance that "he that believeth hath everlasting life," is most explicit as a statement of present fact, and as such is oft reiterated. Objecting to my interpretation of Paul's words above, Mr. Mill has not favoured us with his sense of their meaning. He believes in man's "new life" by regeneration now. Will he plainly inform us whether he believes that at physical death the regenerated soul retains that life, or whether it is then deprived of it? Whether this new life is still his; or, for a time, is his no longer? Does it utterly fail him at this death; or, does it not? I urge a frank reply to this simple inquiry. Certainly the body is lost to this life when it returns to corruption. Mr. Mill, if I mistake not, holds that the soul is equally lost to it, on the body's decease; and so too the spirit, on its return to God "as it was." What then becomes of the "new life" once given, as pertaining to the individual man?

I am represented as denying "in effect" a doctrine of Scripture to which I in truth hold with the utmost tenacity, as my dearest hope. This allegation is made because of my refusal to believe in the re-anima-

Digitized by Google

tion of our present bodies of dust; and preferring, on Scriptural grounds, to believe in the re-clothing of the temporarily defunct soul. Be it that, in the inscrutable working of God, some mysterious link of connection may be maintained through death between the present corruptible and the future incorruptible bodies of his saints, what proof does that afford that the life-germ is not preserved throughout too? Indeed, it seems positive, from the Apostle's saying, that "Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God," that the dust-body of man shall not itself be his glorified body. But how is Mr. Mill justified in supposing that he knows all about St. Paul's meaning in 1 Cor. xv., and in pronouncing that we, in our reading of the grand chapter, reverse its actual teaching? That man, as in the body, should be spoken of as man, is not, as alleged, a plain affirmation that "the body is the man." We customarily use the same mode of expression without intending to make any such affirmation. It is not well thus to assume the point to be proved.

The Scripture does often speak of the soul of man as, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the man, without any mention of the body. See Rom. xiii. 1, and ii. 9, as instances out of many. If man be truly tripartite, then, whilst the combination of the three distinct elements of his being is needful to constitute the perfect man, any one of these elements viewed apart may, it is obvious, rightly be regarded and spoken of as his. But to argue that incomparably the meanest of these elements is, in separation, beyond either or both the other two, entitled exclusively to the distinctive designation of the whole, and that merely because it was the part first formed, seems, to say the least, really very weak. It is better to accept the veritable tripartite division, than to run the absurd risk of reasoning poor man into "a nonentity." But if, on the other hand, life (or the soul;—soul being regarded as a mere synonyme of life) is but the spark resulting from the contact of a portion of God's Spirit with a portion of organised dust, going out the moment that the spirit quits the earthly frame, such life can hardly be esteemed a substantive element of man's nature. "He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust" (Ps. ciii. 14). Obviously we, so far as relates to our frame. We are not all dust. Apart from revelation we may be sure of that. And assuredly the soul and spirit may not be accounted as mere attributes of dust. If man were all body, it would be inappropriate to speak of our body. But if body be but a partite division of man, it is otherwise. Each separate part may be said to be his in relation to the whole. We do not say that man, in his integrity, is all soul.

"To every seed his own body," I cannot interpret with Mr. Mill to mean that "the same body" which is returned to dust is "raised to life." I have understood that as meaning, to every seed its appropriate body. And this seems to be fixed by the Apostle's subsequent illustration. The question to which, I venture to opine, he is rejoining an inspired explanatory reply is, "How are the dead raised up? And with what (kind of) body do they come?" And he says, "That which thou sowest, thou sowest *not* [emphatic in position] the body that shall be, but God *giveth* it a body as it hath pleased him, and to each of the seeds its appropriate body:" "a body of its own," renders Alford; who, having remarked upon v. 37, "the non-identity of the seed with the future plant is insisted on," comments here, "why should it be thought necessary

Digitized by Google

that the same body should rise as was sown?" This is a directly opposite opinion from our opponent's. Which is the soundest and truest, judge we! But, however, Mr. Mill himself thinks that "Paul distinctly teaches the identity of the raised dead, even in the analogy of the seed sown,"—an identity not dependent on "the presence of 'the same dust particles.'" Yet his idea of man is that he is essentially dust. I am entirely at a loss, then, to understand how the same body of dust can be raised, without retaining a portion of "the same dust particles," whilst yet I can hardly imagine Mr. Mill believing that the resurrection body of the redeemed will be, as their first body, a body of dust. I hold that man will be raised out of dust, but not be raised of dust. The dust was to return to the earth as it was; but the Lord of Life and Resurrection will clothe his ransomed brethren in a new body, not of earthly material but of heavenly substance, their "house which is from heaven." Our Lord's flesh passed through death without undergoing corruption. And though he was pleased after his resurrection to retain the same bodily appearance, in order that his disciples might readily identify him, it does not follow that his resurrection body had not undergone a radical change of essence. We doubt not that it had; or he could not have appeared in the midst of his disciples "while they were in a room with the doors shut, and again vanish out of their sight."

G. A. HAYWARD.

(*To be continued.*)

"MOST TO BE PITIED."

"If only in this life we have had hope in Christ, we are of all men most to be pitied."—1 COR. xv. 19. (*Alford.*)

SUPPOSE beyond the cloud of death
The Saviour's face I ne'er should see;
That all were dust and nothingness,
No life save this for thee or me.

Yet surely still it would be well
That I had dreamed so sweet a dream;
Had heard the voice of Love Divine,
Of glory caught some far-off gleam.

What though the music died away
In stillness never broken more;
What though the light should swiftly fade
As sunset gleams from evening shore.

If he who sings in lofty strain*
Be right,—that still 'tis best to love,
Though love be lost, and keen the pain;
Than live, and ne'er its sweetness prove:

Then surely were it good to know
Our heart had felt a Saviour's grace;

* Tennyson.

Digitized by Google

Yet might we yearn no less to see
A God revealed in Jesu's face.

What meaneth Paul, when thus he speaks,—
"Most need of pity then had I,
If finding Christ in this dark world,
I lost Him yet beyond the sky?"

Methinks his warning must be this,—
As meet for Apostolic lips,—
Unless his thought beyond me lies,
And through my mind its meaning slips:—

'Tis well to love and lose, if yet
The love remains, though loved ones die,
And round their image like a nest
The pining doves of memory fly.

But 'tis not well to love and find
The one we loved betray the trust;
That what we spotless deemed, was soiled;
What brightest, eaten through with rust.

Then love is but an added pain;
As one who eats unwholesome food
May find, while still his hunger craves,
The poison creeping through his blood.

If even in this life had failed
Paul's hope in Christ, his loving trust;
Then was indeed his love in vain,
His soul's fair blossom dead as dust.

Because then Christ no more could prove
The Christ he thought he well had known;
The throne vacate, He then must seem
A poor weak idol overthrown.

No more might He be called "THE WAY"
Since He himself had missed the road;
And straying blindly through the night
Had found His end in death—not God.

He were not fitly called "THE TRUTH"
Who boasting much His might to save
Himself had perished in the fight,
And lay a dead man in His grave.

He could not be "THE LIFE" indeed,
In whose frail armour Death had found
A place to fix his awful dart,
And reign once more the spectre *crowned*.

Ah! truly, Paul, deep pity then
Had been for thee a tribute meet;
To know that glory was a dream,
To find the Lord so loved a cheat!

* D. M. A.

Digitized by Google

MAN AND HIS FAILURES.

"Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions."—ECCLES. viii. 29.

WHEN God created Adam he was made in the image of his Creator, in righteousness and true holiness; and renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him. For the first and only time in the history of man, he was perfection, and possessed freewill. Perfect in knowledge, and perfect in holiness; but free will was too much for human nature to stand the test of Satan's temptation; he fell at the first onslaught, and was expelled from Eden. He listened to Satan's lie, accepted it, and thereby impeached the truth of God. The wreck is great, as we may learn from the dilapidated, devastated, and dismantled condition of those great faculties of the mind, the affections of the heart, and the inner and outer nature of man: just as we judge of a wreck by the torn and shattered timber washed ashore, or as we judge of the history of a house that has been shattered by the tempest or by the flash of lightning, and now lies in ruins. Man's defection from his primitive state was voluntary, and from the unconstrained choice of his own mutable and self-determined will: so that now, as we learn from experience as well as from Scripture, his nature has become universally depraved and sinful. After Eden and its failure, came the succeeding ages when God's Spirit strove with man until it ended in destruction in the days of Noah, and "every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, from man unto (LXX. et Vul.)* cattle, and the creeping things and the fowl of the heaven, and they were destroyed from the earth." (Gen. vii. 23.) With them perished the offspring of the "sons of God," and the "fair daughters of men."

Passing over the successive ages, including the Israelitish dispensation, which was, so far as man is concerned, a failure, and which has been swept away or trodden under foot of the Gentiles, until the "times of the Gentiles" be fulfilled, we pause at this termination of the age before the flood to ask what shall be the end of the present? Shall it be successful or shall it be a failure? Bear in mind, the question affects man only, for God is true and righteous altogether. With him is no "variableness neither shadow of turning." He is faithful and true: but in the dispensations of his mercy he has weak and fallen man to do with: and the question I have to deal with now is the end of this dispensation as it affects man.

Let us mingle with his beloved twelve on the hill of Olivet after he had spoken to them about the decadence of the Jewish ritual and nation. He had ended his observations, and denounced Jerusalem for unbelief and hardness of heart, and then leaving the city, the disciples grouped around him, calling his attention to the beautiful buildings of the Temple, deprecating, as it would seem, the announcement made by Christ of the utter destruction of the whole place and people. To this the reply was plain: "Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down:" and then, as he

* Ab homine usque ad pecus, tam reptile.

Digitized by Google

sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming (παρούσιας) and the end of the age (αἰῶνος).

Two questions are here asked respecting two events,—*first*, the desolation of Jerusalem, and *second*, the sign of Christ coming and of the end of the age; both of which, it is evident, the disciples assigned to one and the same time, and not incorrectly according to their light, inasmuch as the Old Testament prophecies, with which they were conversant, especially Daniel xi. 45 and xii. 1-3, and Zechariah xiv., had identified troubles in Judea, and a siege of Jerusalem by invading armies, with the coming of the Lord in power and glory. And to these unprecedented troubles, yet future, and the second advent of Christ, the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew primarily refers; while at the same time it has a reference, secondary and subordinate, to the desolation of Jerusalem, then near, which as the close of that dispensation, and the day of judgment on the Jewish people, was an accurate type of the second coming of the Lord in judgment, and of the end of this age. Thus, by the double fulfilment (not by any means peculiar to it), all difficulty is removed in the way of understanding this remarkable prophecy, and reconciling the various parts. Step by step the blessed Saviour unfolds the great future of his second advent. That it will be sudden and unexpected as a flash of lightning from the East; that both the heavens and the earth shall be affected by it: "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken" (ver. 29), and "upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring, men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." (Luke xxi. 25 and 26.) One sign shall quickly follow another, both in the heavens and on the earth. The whole series of events shall transpire in the compass of one generation: that the same generation shall witness the beginning and the end of the tribulation. Our own translation of the passage has sadly mistified many readers of prophetical Scriptures, who refer the event to the generation which witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem. *This* generation should be, according to the Greek, "*That* generation (ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη) shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled" (ver. 34). At the advent of Christ, then, the world shall not be converted, for the great mass of the people will dread his appearing. "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be!" In what respect were the nations of the flood obnoxious to God? They were intelligent and intellectual. The flood swept away civilised men, not savages. Civilisation was the normal condition of the men of that age. Shinar was the centre of civilisation. We are not acquainted with the habits and customs of the people before the flood, except in the short verses of Gen. iv., where we are told that amongst the family of Lamech, were not only such as dwell in tents and have cattle, but such as handle the harp and the organ, and the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron. Our Lord tells us something of their domestic and business habits: "They were eating and drinking, marrying and given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took

Digitized by Google

them away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Now there is nothing wrong in such pursuits,—probably they flattered themselves, as we do now, in their domestic duties and happiness, and their good business habits, particularly about their forethought in speculations for the future. It does not mean that these things were wrong, but only that such was their actual employment. In fact their business was legitimate so far as it went. There was no harm in sweet sounds from the harp and the organ (we read in the Book of Revelation of harpers in heaven), but they were making the world pleasant *without God*. These are the efforts of man, but God will not be put out of his own creation, nor from the grateful hearts of his creatures. Indeed it is marvellous, when we know by the light of revelation the true character of all that is invested with the deceitful colouring of Satan,—to see that all man glories in as his own, as the proof of his own wisdom and excellence,—all that he does and rejoices in, is but remedy against himself. The proudest results of science and art are but devices,—imperfect devices,—necessitated by the devastating effects of his own sin, without which they had never been, and simple proof of his being resolved to do without God, and to act for himself. Thus he endeavours to hide the witnesses of evil, which rise up against him wheresoever he moves; and for death, too, if it might be, he would find a remedy,—but there is none. He would put it out of sight if it were possible; but still it remains, the last humbling evidence of his actual condition, the true value of himself and all his works. Is there any difference between our age and the age before the flood? Where is the difference? They had their "harps and organs,"—so have we. They had their "artificers in brass and iron,"—so have we. They had tents and cattle,—so have we, and probably in much better taste. It was a world then without God, so it is now. The like tree produces like fruit. Man is carrying on the world by himself and for himself, endeavouring to keep God out of his sight, as much as possible to do without God, lest God should get at his conscience and make him miserable.

Many will object to these remarks, and cite instances of the progress of civilisation through Christianity, and hold up, as they have frequently done, instances of the moral improvement of the world at large and of our own country in particular; and the success of the various missionary societies. Mere morality, however, is not Christianity; and without Christianity it is only whitewash that can be easily obliterated: a pin will pick it off. "We build churches and chapels by the hundred, and is not that an evidence of Christianity ruling in our midst?" It is an evidence of great "religious activity," as Lord Shaftesbury termed it some few years ago; but it is not an evidence of Christian life, no more than an evidence of the same in the crowded congregations of some popular preacher. The bowing of the head, and the bending of the knee, is not an evidence of Christian life, no more than the wearing a diamond cross or a Romish scapular is an evidence of the Christianity of the wearers of such badges of pride or superstition. The heart may be as far from God as the heathens, or as the Jewish people in the days of Isaiah, who "draw near to me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart from me."

Digitized by Google

We need not pride ourselves that we are better for our Christianity than the people before the flood. We are in the habit of speaking a great deal of the progress of this nineteenth century: availing ourselves of the labour and research, the trials and guesses, and successes and failures of men fully our equals, and who were our pioneers in every science. We have in these days, no doubt, seen a wonderful progress in many of the arts and sciences of civilisation; but we do not think that all our progress can bear comparison with the quick and wonderful development of the first generations of men, deriving their civilisation from that first man Adam, who was the son of God. We must remember that they were inventors, not improvers; originators each of his art or science, not adroit or lucky followers, riding the horse which another has broken in. We are not superior to the age before the flood in the arts and sciences, considering our advantages over them as inventors and originators; but we are equal to them in the point dwelt upon by Christ when alluding to his second advent—i.e. forgetfulness of God: "they knew not until the flood came and took them away;" and "so shall also the coming of the Son of man be:" "Likewise also," says Jesus in Luke xvii., "as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded;" (all things not only lawful, but commendable;) "but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained down fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." The error of these people of Sodom and the antediluvian error lay in this: they ignored the presence of God and his message of the world's doom through his preacher of righteousness, Noah. No doubt they thought he was a madman, and treated his message accordingly, though for the long period of 120 years when the long-suffering of God waited, and while the ark was a preparing, they heard the message to flee from the wrath to come, and heard it undismayed. Likewise, Lot, at the request of the angels at Sodom, went out and spake unto his sons-in-law, which married his daughters: "Up, get you out of this place; for the Lord will destroy this city. But he seemed as one that mocked unto his sons-in-law." Well, are we in a better case? Do we live in times when your message of the second advent is heard and believed? Certainly not,—not an iota better in that respect. We are told to expect it, for the Spirit of God by his apostle says, "Beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time." Not believers, but "mockers!" And we are still further warned of the special subject for mockers, that is, the second advent of our blessed Lord; and where the servants of Christ are exhorted to be faithful to him and his message. "That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour: knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation;"—ignoring the recorded fact that creation was overturned at the flood, and the cities of the plain overwhelmed in destruction. So shall it be at the end of this

Digitized by Google

dispensation of grace. Christianity is not a failure, as some infidels have stated and would have it; but man has failed, is failing in it.

May God keep our eyes looking for the "bright and morning star," and our hearts waiting for him, for "he that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure."

Cramlington. GEORGE LLOYD.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE SPIRIT.

DEAR SIR.—I have to apologise to Mr. Constable for an unintentional misrepresentation of his views about the spirits of the departed as "gone back to God as fully and finally as in the case of the beasts that perish or of those who are annihilated in the second death." The words "and finally," in that sentence, are, I see and acknowledge, a mistake.

I confess, however, I do not see that there is much importance in the mistake. For, of course, I admitted that Mr. Constable holds that the dead will be raised; but whether that will be brought about by the old spirits being put into the resurrection bodies, or (as I understood to be Mr. Constable's view of the matter) by God simply breathing once more the breath of life into those bodies, matters little, so far as I can see, unless the spirits have remained living entities meantime, i.e., between death and resurrection.

How Mr. Constable maintains personal identity between the Paul that lived and died long ago and the Paul that will rise again, while he denies the continued living existence of Paul's spirit, I cannot understand, and would be glad if Mr. Constable would inform us.

We who believe that "the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord" "do live with God," and that "the souls of the faithful are with him in" comparative "joy and felicity"—who believe that they being unclothed of the mortal body will be reclothed with the immortal resurrection body, and are meantime, to use St. Paul's expression, "naked" spirits, have no difficulty in this most important matter, so essential, as it seems, to all right thoughts about the resurrection or (for *mutatis mutandis*, we hold the same as regards all the dead) about human responsibility and judgment to come.

Yours faithfully,
W. J. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas Parsonage,
Douglas.

NARROW VIEWS AND BROAD VIEWS.

DEAR SIR,—May I be allowed to say, in answer to Mr. Cameron, that though it is of course possible to interpret the broad and consolatory texts of the Bible by the narrow and alarming ones, it is, I venture to think, much more glorious and more in accordance with the revealed character of God, to interpret the narrow by the broad.

I am unorthodox enough to believe that God has in store for his weak erring creatures dealings of infinitely greater love than we have the least idea of; and I confess to

Digitized by Google

the strongest sympathy with the Syro-Phœnician woman who refused to take no for an answer even from Christ himself—being convinced, as I am, that though, like Joseph, Christ may at present sometimes speak harshly to us. He is in reality longing to reveal himself in his true character.

I believe that Mr. Cameron is no whit behind me in earnest *desire* that it may be so, and I am sure that in accordance with his promise, God will do exceedingly above all than we can ask or think.

T. W.

TWICE HUNG!

Dear Sir,—Are we not wonderfully inconsistent personages? Have we not reason to be proud of our achievements in absurdity? We have all been shocked at the barbarities and brutalities of the "Unspeakable Turk;" and the other day people held up their hands in horror, as well they might, at the story of a man who, escaping strangulation for ten minutes by the breaking of the rope, was hung to the entire vindication of the majesty of law. And yet the humane people whose "blood ran cold" at this story of agony, tell us, without the least emotion, that God will torment men in fire for ever, and keep them alive by his almighty power for the sole purpose of being tormented! Amazing that this blasphemous falsehood can find a single advocate in the world!

Yours faithfully,

Theophilus.

MINISTERIAL SUCCESS.

Dear Sir,—We must live and learn. I had supposed that "Ministerial Success" meant faithfulness, whether men would hear or forbear—a noble, self-denying adherence to the revealed will of God, even with comparatively empty pews and a correspondingly empty purse. From my reading of the New Testament,—ay, and of the Old Testament too,—I felt *sure* that a full and clear exposition of divine truth could not and would not be "popular." It is not in the nature of things that it should; and success must therefore mean the approbation of the Master, as in Paul's case, though all men forsake the servant.

But it seems I was mistaken. I now learn that success is measured by a monetary sliding scale. I am obliged to my instructors on this important matter, and shall henceforth, when visiting any town, inquire for the minister who has the largest salary, that, during my temporary sojourn, I may be edified by his ministry. I understand that a preacher who has a thousand pounds a year is sure to provide an admirable essay for Sunday enjoyment; but if you can find one who has twelve hundred, "and deserves more," then you may take your rest with thankfulness, and feel yourself a truly privileged pilgrim.

It is true I used to have great reverence for those devoted servants of Jesus Christ who manage to be gentlemen, and keep out of debt with a small salary, and on Sundays teach the glorious truths of the gospel with a freshness which refreshes all who hear them. But that was in the days of my ignorance. I know better now. Such men are not worthy to preside over any of our great religious societies, for it is obvious that neither they nor their churches can give large

Digitized by Google

subscriptions. Wealthy people will, of course, go to the grand churches. Respectability is a matter of *immense* importance! If you wish to book for heaven, go by "first-class." Hurrah for Mammon!

Your enlightened servant,

AUSTIN MARCH.

LITERATURE.

Children of God. "*There's a Good Time Coming.*" *Heavy Hearts and How to Lighten Them. How to be rid of the Fear of Death.*

SUCH are the titles of four two-page tracts, published by Kellaway and Co., at ninepence per hundred. They are simple, evangelical, and free from objectionable matter. They place the blessed hope of the Lord's return before the reader in a few appropriate words, and breathe a loving spirit. For enclosure in letters or hand-to-hand gifts, nothing can be better.

"*A Vindication of the Honour of God.* In a refutation of Doctrines of Eternal Misery and Universal Salvation." London: Printed for Author. Sold by J. Johnson, St. Paul's Churchyard. 1792.

We have lately had the great pleasure of reading this work. As we believe that there are very few copies of it in existence, we will mention that the one which we saw is in the possession of the Rev. E. W. Bullinger, and was shown to us by our friend the Rev. Dr. Leask. We understand that Mr. Waylen, a well-known name to the readers of the RAINBOW, is about to favour us with a history of our great question, "Life in Christ." We will venture to recommend to his notice the work in question, as its publication in the year 1792 is well worthy of note.

We should be very glad to know the name of the man who wrote this remarkable book. It was, however, printed without a name. Whether it was known at the time of publication we cannot surmise. An observation of the writer in his introduction—"I have ventured out of the common footpath, and have little doubt but I shall be reckoned a trespasser for doing so"—suggests the idea that prudential motives may have led him to the concealment of his name. Perhaps some of our readers may have it in their power to discover his secret. He now is deaf alike to praise or to blame, but we would be glad to hold up to honour the man who did a good work for God's honour nearly a century ago. He calls his book "a little tract," but it is a fair-sized octavo volume. Books were bulkier then than they are now, and readers more patient and enduring.

As we cannot give the name of the writer, we will give our opinion of his character as an author. He is well-informed, logical, and clear. We wonder that his work did not make more noise in the theological world than it would appear to have done. We can only account for it by supposing that it came before its time, just as there were Reformers before the Reformation. Yet it, as they, doubtless did its work, though it was not blazoned abroad. He was one of the true heroes who labour while others enter upon their labours. All honour be to such.

Digitized by Google

The agreement of our author with us on the great points of eternal misery and universal salvation is complete. As we proceed in his book we recognise to our great satisfaction the exact outline of the thought and argument which we have from the very first taken ourselves.

A deep regard for the character of God lies at the root of all his reasoning (2). He thinks of the character of God, good, loving, merciful, just! He asks if eternal torment for wrong-doing is an idea conceivable of such a God? The mind of the believer revolts from it. It has led multitudes to infidelity. Is it taught in the *Word?* He examines that Word patiently, candidly, deeply, and comes to the joyful conclusion that such a doctrine is not contained within its pages.

Like all the writers on our side with whom we are acquainted, our author exhibits throughout his book a profound reverence for Scripture. This general feature of our school is a strong argument for its truth. When Scripture is really against a theory we always find its advocates, whatever affectation of respect for it they may make, in one way or other derogating from it. Rome adds its unwritten tradition to an insufficient written record. Socinianism detracts from its inspiration. We reverence God's Word as the ultimate, sufficient, authoritative standard of doctrine. For our own part we can truly say that we never reverenced it so deeply as since, under its guidance, we studied this great question; and saw how its plain unforced language vindicated our Father's character in his treatment of all the creatures of his hands.

While reading this able work we were not a little gratified at finding in it confirmation of our view of human nature as we have put it forward in our work on "Hades" (55, 148). Here many who agree with us on the great question of future punishment disapprove of what we have said. For ourselves we see no reason to withdraw what we have said. On the contrary, we are more and more convinced of its truth, and convinced that it will prevail. Our author's examination of the old text, Genesis ii. 7, which is the true key to this part of the subject, is masterly in the extreme.

The usual conclusion to the praise of a book is to advise one's readers to go and buy it. We cannot do this here, as the work is out of print. All we can say to our readers is that if any of them are fond of looking over collections of second-hand books, and see one with this title, *buy it.* It is a good book. It is a convincing book. It is a rare book. It shows us brave and true minds battling for our noble cause when we thought it almost, if not altogether, without a living advocate.

Of that portion of his work which treats on "Universal Salvation" we will only make one remark. We do so merely as indicative of a state of opinion which, we must say, surprised us. We thought that at the close of the 18th century, and in England, a belief in "Universal Salvation" was a very rare thing indeed. Our author, however, tells us that in his time it was a "fashionable" opinion (247). It only affords additional proof of man's rejection of the theory of eternal pain and evil as unjust, when, ignorant of the Scriptural doctrine, he rushes as a refuge from it to a view for which there is scarcely the shadow of an apparent support in Scripture. HENRY CONSTABLE.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JUNE, 1877.

THE GRECIAN HERESY.

THE body is a clog to the mind; and the soul is capable of perfection only when delivered from its material incumbrance. So, the Phædo of Plato would lead us to suppose, thought and taught some of the leading philosophers of Greece; and so have thought and taught countless generations of quasi-Platonists from that day down to our own. Accordingly we find, as William Robinson of Cambridge has reminded us, that "whenever the resurrection of the dead is introduced argumentatively in the New Testament, the argument is addressed to Greeks, or to people among whom Grecian sentiments prevailed; and the false notion that disembodiment was necessary to perfect wisdom and happiness best explains the earnestness with which Paul assured the Corinthians that his ambition was, "not to be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Viewing the matter in this light, we see at once what a stumbling block the Christian doctrine of the resurrection must have been to the Sophists, and what a subject of laughter to the Epicureans. No wonder that the speculative idlers of the Forum should sarcastically exclaim, "What is it that this babbler is asserting?" No wonder that they bestowed the smile of pity on a crew of enthusiasts who proclaimed wherever they went, "We care nothing about your Elysium; we have no desire to be sublimated into pure spirit: we groan indeed, but not for this; on the contrary, 'we groan within ourselves, waiting for the end of the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body' [Alford's version]. Resurrection is our theme; resurrection is our hope."

It is observable that the Apostle Paul never evinces much anxiety to impress on the minds of the early believers the canonical authority of all the traditions and narratives which were then floating about among the disciples, and which are now accepted under the names of the four evangelists. He never seems under the temptation, like Justin Martyr and some other wordy disputants,

Digitized by Google

to retail Gospel anecdotes, to institute fanciful analogies, to interpret parables, or to lay any great stress on the class of pictorial facts which Luke afterwards undertook to gather and to collate. He abstains even from dwelling on the Lord's preceptive communications; and though he once took occasion to recite a short speech, namely when he exhorted the Ephesian bishops to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that it was more blessed to give than to receive, it happens to be a speech for which he has the authority of neither Matthew, Mark, Luke, nor John; nor, possibly enough, that of any other of the now forgotten Gospels. "Jesus Christ after the flesh" was a stage in his mental history which he had been permitted to dismiss:—a spectacle of infinite pathos, but now superseded by something more venerable still. It was the Christ of the Resurrection which had come to fill the entire field of his vision and to satisfy his quenchless ardour. This one stupendous towering fact sufficed to give to all the other facts, whether accessory or preliminary, their value, their meaning, and their veracity. Therefore it was that he could summarise the marvellous story in such brief utterance as the following, addressed to his son Timothy, "Keep in remembrance Jesus Christ raised from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my Gospel." There it is; all comprised in fifteen words. How brief the formula; but how comprehensive the argument—how sublime in its simplicity! Those fifteen words constituted the legend and banner-scroll under which Paul freely fought and cheerfully fell. They were to him the gathered rays of the manifold wisdom of God, meeting in one dazzling focus, and blinding the worshipper's eye to every other object. With such a guiding star in view, he must needs fight the good fight, and himself become to others a burning and a shining light. He might even be indulged with a transient rapture into Paradise; whether bodily or mentally, mattered little. But over and above all, there was one abiding conviction which he could never shake off, though its pressure upon his yearning heart diminished day by day as he drew near to his eternal rest; the fact, namely, that the culminating point of identification with the risen Christ would be reached only when he himself should permanently resume the body. Everything short of this faded from his view.

Now, this is what the Greeks thought so very foolish. And are there not many modern Grecian Christians who occupy an analogous position, and virtually oppose the Apostle on the same ground when they express such a lofty disdain of matter? Its Maker pronounced it very good; and Paul represents it as an essential element of true humanity; hence the recoil, the shuddering, the revulsion of feeling with which he ever regards the hypothetical possibility of an unclothed state. If it were not thus, what should have hindered the Platonists from turning round upon him and saying,—"Then how about that disembodied condition which some of your followers call the intermediate state and describe as embracing all the heaven

Digitized by Google

which the largest mind can conceive. Is not this a concession to our philosophy?"* "Ah, well," we may imagine the Apostle replying, "I am not answerable for their false psychology. Would they but accept the psychology of the Hebrew Scriptures, the only philosophical book in the world, they would preach a more intelligible gospel. For myself, I know of only two alternatives, present life and perfected life. My present life is taken up with the preparation of myself and my beloved converts against THAT DAY. When my turn comes to fall asleep, I shall close my eyes only to open them on the glories of THAT DAY. You and your intermediate metaphysics are a cloud of thick darkness which would fain obscure the beatific vision; but, thank God, nothing shall intervene in arrest of that miraculous awakening when the perfected humanity of the elect church shall be fitted to apprehend the humanity of its Saviour."

Has it never struck the Pauline student to mark the elastic spring with which the Apostle passes from the present life to Life to come; and then to compare it with modern speculations about the economy, the philosophy, the occupations, and the sensations of the middle passage? It is as if an artillerist, having covered with his piece some distant object, should, instead of eagerly watching for the impact, languidly discourse about the missile's flight. One glance at resurrection-life from his stand-point might well suffice, one would think, to reduce the matter to the simple element where his great strength lay.

Departure from the primitive belief that death passeth upon all men, having once set in, grotesque and manifold are the shapes which have taken its place. Of these, purgatorial inventions and the invocation of saints have long been the most popular, and the most profitable to the clergy. But Protestantism has furnished additional varieties; and that amphibious creature, the intermediate man, has been constructed of such diverse materials, located in such fantastic regions, and quickened into such a variety of animated forms, that his place in creation is every day becoming more and more mythical. With some, he is pure soul; with some, pure spirit; with others, his personality is preserved by a material of ether-like tenuity; with others as in Dr. Watts's lyrics, he is equipped with angelic attributes; with others again, he is neither alive nor dead; with all, he is a being totally different from anything treated of by Paul.

* The exact words here referred to are as follows:—"He" [Paul] "describes the disembodied state as To be with Christ. A very exclusive idea? No, a very inclusive idea, for it takes in all the heaven which the largest mind can conceive." From "For ever with the Lord," a sermon by C. H. Spurgeon, 12th Oct. 1873. Should any quarrel with the notion of an ancient sophist quoting a modern, I would remind them that the phenomenon has occurred before, when

> "There was an ancient sage philosopher
> Who had read Alexander Ross over."—*Hudibras.*

Digitized by Google

Thus, while there are gradations and modifications of the Grecian idea, the average belief still regards the disembodied state as one more favourable for the apprehension of pleasure and pain than the previous life on earth. Isaac Taylor's definition of it as "a state in which human nature, reduced to its simplest element, shall exist in one mood only, that of an intense consciousness of its own moral condition," would perhaps have been applauded by an ancient Greek; but alas, alas, what is the end gained by such an hypothesis? As a form of punishment on the other hand it might have found favour with Ignatius, who in a remarkable passage in his epistle to the church at Smyrna, meets the gainsayers with a threat that they should be reduced to the condition of naked spirits.

But now, in conclusion, to go back to Paul once more and imagine him basking in this South American atmosphere of intense moral consciousness; how does the thing strike on our own moral intelligence? It sounds very Coleridgean; but as Paul was not in the habit of indulging in the jargon about positivity, subjectivity, and objectivity, I can only fancy him calmly replying to a suggestion of this nature, that his work was done, and that he was now looking to be endued with something a little more tangible than his own moral consciousness. This was a form of study of which he had already had quite enough. As an absorbing object of contemplation it was eminently unsatisfactory; and therefore, dear brethren and sisters in Christ —Good night.

"To-morrow to fresh woods and pastures new."

J. WAYLEN.

THE FAMILY THAT JESUS LOVED.

"ON the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, about two miles from Jerusalem, stands a poor village, bearing the name of El-Azirezeh, which, being the Arabic form of the name Lazarus, at once identifies it with the Bethany of the gospels. Stanley describes it, as—'a wild mountain hamlet, screened by an intervening ridge from the view of the top of Olivet—perched on its open plateau of rock—the last collection of human habitations before the desert-hills that reach to Jericho. . . . High in the distance are the Peræan mountains; the foreground is the deep descent of the mountain valley.' 'The fields around,' says Anderson, 'lie uncultivated, and covered with rank grass and wild flowers; but it is easy to imagine the deep and still beauty of this spot, when it was the home of Lazarus and his sisters, Martha and Mary. Defended on the north and west by the Mount of Olives, it enjoys a delightful exposure to the southern sun. The grounds around are obviously of great fertility, though quite neglected; and the prospect to the south-east commands a magnificent view of the Dead Sea and the plains of Jordan.'

Digitized by Google

"Miss Martineau describes it as 'a village inhabited by twenty families; a very poor place, but looking less squalid than might be expected, from its houses being built—as everywhere in that country—of stone; square, substantial, and large dwellings, compared with village abodes elsewhere. Its position on the side of the hill is very fine, seen from below. The moment of interest, however, is in crossing the ridge above, when one is about to lose sight of Jerusalem, towering on its Zion behind, and to drop down into the village which lies so quietly among its olive groves and fields.'" *

This is Bethany,—a place sacred and familiar to every one who loves the Lord Jesus Christ. "From its quiet palm trees he issued forth on his last day's journey across Mount Olivet. It was at Bethany he ascended to heaven. Its soil was the last he trod—its homes were the last on which his eye rested when the cloud received him up into glory." But what renders Bethany so dear to the Christian is the circumstance that here "the Man of Sorrows," amid his constant cares and toils for the house of Israel, sometimes sought rest and refreshment in the home of the quiet family—of a brother and two sisters—named Lazarus, Martha, and Mary. Their affection for him is very manifest in the sacred narrative; and so is his love for them; for not only did they share that common love of his which led him to give "his life for the life of the world;" but in a special and peculiar sense, for his beloved disciple informs us that "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus."

Our present purpose is to call attention to the characters of these three friends of Jesus as we find them described in the sacred narrative. And first in order we take

MARTHA,

who seems to have been the elder of the two sisters. This we infer from the circumstance that it was she who "received Jesus into her house" (Luke x. 38), and had the management of its domestic affairs—a circumstance which at once explains why she was "encumbered with much serving." For the duties of household management she seems to have been thoroughly qualified. "Bustling, energetic, impulsive," she "grappled with the stern realities of actual life; quick in apprehension, strong and vigorous in intellect, anxious to give a reason for all she did, and requiring a reason for the conduct of others." (Luke x. 40; John xi. 20, 39.) We have a strong impression that the character of Martha is generally misunderstood, and greatly undervalued. From what our Lord said to her when she complained to him of her sister Mary's leaving all the household work to her, while she sat doing nothing (Luke

* These and other extracts are taken from "Memories of Bethany." London: Nisbet & Co.

Digitized by Google

x. 41, 42), it is commonly concluded that Martha was a worldly-minded woman who cared for nothing beyond the present state of existence. This impression is by no means warranted by the records of Luke and John. If Martha was "cumbered about much serving," it was because so much serving was left her to do; when on another occasion—a week before his death—Jesus was at Bethany, and they made him a supper, John is careful to mention that "Martha served." (John xii. 2.) Being a thoroughly practical woman we need not wonder that, on the occasions referred to she felt annoyed at the conduct of her less energetic sister Mary, who sat listening at the Master's feet, while all the serving was left to her. She, too, would have liked to have heard the words of wisdom and grace which fell from the lips of the Lord; and by her sister helping her she would have been able the sooner to have enjoyed the blessing. Hence her anxiety that the Lord would bid her sister come and help her. Let it be also noticed that, in all likelihood, Martha was busy preparing refreshment for their Divine Guest, as well as for themselves, and therefore would have something extra to do. Most assuredly Martha's faith in Jesus as the Messiah was as firm, and her love for him as strong as that of her more tender and impressible sister. Think of her conduct and her confession on that memorable day when Jesus came to Bethany to awake Lazarus from the sleep of death. "Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met him;" and her first words to him were strikingly expressive of her confidence in his power and regard: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died; but I know that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, he will give it thee." And when the Lord asked her whether she believed him to be "the Resurrection and the Life," she readily responded: "Yea, Lord! I believe that thou art the Christ who should come into the world." (John xi. 20-27.)

Most assuredly she was a woman of faith and piety; one of those who, while "not slothful in business," is "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." And as such Martha is well worthy of the esteem of her faithful sisters in Christ Jesus in the present day—many of them would do well to follow her example of practical service for the well-being and comfort of others. And those of them who, like Martha, have all the cares and toil of household management and work, bearing on them so heavily and constantly that an exceedingly small margin of time is left them for intellectual culture or quiet meditation, should remember, and be encouraged by the thought that "Jesus loved Martha," as well as "her sister and Lazarus." And let those who have less to do of the drudgery of labour, and more opportunity of mental culture, beware of despising their less fortunate sisters, who are too often "cumbered with much serving."

MARY.

The glimpses we have in the sacred narrative of the character of

Digitized by Google

Mary render her peculiarly attractive and endearing. Her impressive tenderness and affection, are reflected all the more brightly in the light of the bolder, logical, and energetic nature of her sister Martha. When the announcement of the Lord's approach was made to the sisters, Martha at once went and met him, but "Mary sat still in the house." Not because she was indifferent to his presence—her future conduct shows how she loved him—but her more sensitive nature was so completely prostrated by grief at her brother's death, as to be, for the moment, heedless of all else. The instant, however, that Martha told her that the Master had come and desired to see her, she, without speaking a word, rose and followed her sister to the spot where Jesus stood, and falling down at his feet, exclaimed, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." Sitting was a common posture assumed by the Israelitish people while suffering intense grief. Thus Ezra, when he heard that the people of Israel, and their priests, princes, and rulers had, notwithstanding the severe punishments that had been inflicted on them by the hand of God for persistent violations of his holy commandments, had again set that law at defiance, by intermarrying with idolaters, "rent his garment and mantle, and plucked off the hair of his head and of his beard, and *sat down* astonied." (Ezra ix. 1-3.) So Nehemiah, when he learnt that the remnant of his people that had escaped captivity were "in great affliction and reproach," and that "the wall of Jerusalem was broken down and the gates thereof burned with fire," "sat down and wept and mourned." (Neh. i. 1-4; see also Isa. iii. 26; Ezek. viii. 14.) This fact, taken in connection with the circumstances, fully warrants our estimate of Mary's conduct in "sitting still in the house," and expressing her feelings so briefly at the Master's feet. He, too, sympathising with her intense sorrow, receives her in silence; no doubt imparting to her, at the same time, all the comfort and consolation that melting emotion can when expressed by other means than words.

Mary seems to have been one of those tender spirits that are apt to bend and droop under "the rough blasts of life," and require the constant support and encouragement of stronger and more aggressive minds. How lovely she seems, all meekness and tenderness, sitting at the Saviour's feet, drinking in those words of wisdom and comfort falling from his sacred lips; asking no questions, requiring no reasons, but with childlike confidence, simplicity, and earnestness, listening to the Master's voice! What a fine example of genuine discipleship! Thus it is that those true disciples of the Great Teacher, whose natural constitution unfits them for soldierlike service, may still adorn the doctrine of Christ—mute, yet "living epistles of Christ, known and read of all men."

Mary's tenderness of character and love for her Saviour are well illustrated in the scene described by John in the twelfth chapter of his narrative. On the last Sabbath before he suffered, Jesus

Digitized by Google

sought the retirement and society of Lazarus and his sisters at Bethany. They gladly welcomed him, and "made him a supper." Lazarus, whom he had restored to life, after being buried four days, sat at the table with him. Martha is busy as usual, doing her best to serve. These were deeds of ordinary hospitality. Mary's affection prompts her to a more ostensible and striking expression of esteem. Standing behind the Saviour, she takes a pound of costly ointment, and pours it on his feet; and, in the fulness of her affection and devotion, stooping down, she wipes them with the loosened tresses of her hair, while the costly perfume fills the room. Her gracious Master far from being insensible to this expression of esteem, rebuked the greedy grumblers at this costly offering, saying: "Let her alone, against the day of my burying hath she kept this."

These words of Jesus suggest the idea that Mary had for some time previously, had the precious ointment by her; whether intended for this occasion or not, it could not have been used more opportunely; so near the close of the Saviour's mortal life, that it might well be said to have been kept for his burial rites. Doubtless it was the most costly offering she could give,—she did "what she could," and it was that which constituted the value and expressiveness of the action.

Blessed Mary! this kindly deed of thine shall never be forgotten, for "Wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world this shall be spoken for a memorial" of thee!

LAZARUS.

Of the character of Lazarus little is revealed. We are not favoured with such glimpses of his inner life, as are afforded us of his worthy sisters. Of this, however, we may be sure, that he was one of those who "waited for the consolation of Israel," and like Martha and Mary, believed that Jesus was indeed "the Christ, the Son of God, who should come into the world." From the touching sorrow of his sisters at his death, it is clearly seen that he was a brother beloved, around whom their tenderest affections were entwined. There must surely have been something peculiarly dear in that man for whom the Lord had such special regard, as is indicated in the language: "Lord, behold he whom thou lovest is sick." Very likely the knowledge of that fact led those who witnessed the tears of sympathy flow from the Saviour's eyes, to exclaim: "Behold, how he loved him!" John himself tells us that "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus." (John xi. 3, 5, 36.) It seems reasonable to believe that this friendship of Jesus for the brother of Martha and Mary was formed on the same principles as such friendships are generally formed—a similarity of disposition. We cannot help thinking of Lazarus as being pious, tender, and kind; an "Israelite indeed in whom was no guile."

Digitized by Google

Such were the inmates of the quiet home at Bethany, where the Lord was wont to seek a short retreat from his contests with the hypocritical Pharisees and carping Scribes, and find refreshing rest when worn out with his arduous labours of love. "We can fancy those happy meetings when the pilgrim Saviour, weary and worn, was seen descending the rocky footpath of Olivet, Lazarus or his sisters, from the flat roof of their dwelling, or under the spreading fig tree, eager to catch the first glimpse of his approach."

In the friendship of Jesus for Lazarus and his sisters, we get a view of his inner life; we see how perfectly "the Word had been made flesh," a real human brother, who can fully sympathise with all the feelings of our nature, apart from sin. Though his heart was large enough to embrace the whole family of man, and to give his life for the world, still he had his likings for particular individuals—congenial spirits, whose society he preferred to that of others. He loved all his disciples, and called them "friends," yet we find Peter, James, and John, the favoured associates of his private hours, to whom he unbosoms himself in a manner different from that to the rest, and of these three, one is spoken of as "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

From these incidents in the life of Jesus, we see how like he was to his brethren in the social affinities of their nature. He was no ascetic, but countenanced and enjoyed the amenities of friendship. A solitary man indeed he was; and often retired to be alone with God, yet he was no hermit. The story of his short eventful life is redolent of sympathy and encouragement to the endearments of social life. Reflected there, we see him to be not only the Saviour, but the friend of man.

It is well for us at times so to think of him; for often the solace and comfort of such thoughts are needed by those who try to follow in his footsteps. As he felt then, so does he now. How refreshing the thought to the weary heart, who, though it sees him not, yet loving him rejoices "with joy unspeakable and full of glory!"

W. Laing.

MODERN UNBELIEF.

III.—METHODS OF DEALING WITH IT.

In preceding papers we have considered the prevalence of unbelief, and inquired concerning its causes. Dr. Ellicott, after pursuing a somewhat similar course proceeded, as we have seen, to the presentation of arguments by which some of its particular forms might be met; and to a consideration of the best modes of dealing with it in general. The question was asked: "If unbelief is now spreading silently and everywhere, and if its general characteristics are what have been described, how can it best be met by us in our general

Digitized by Google

teaching?" This question, asked by the bishop of his clergy, I would ask, with a slight alteration of terms, of every intelligent Christian believer. I do so being willing to aid, as far as I can, in returning some practical and satisfactory answers, and in doing this shall gladly make use of many excellent things contained in Dr. Ellicott's own reply.

It is difficult to imagine that any of the readers for whom these papers are intended regard the subject of which they treat with indifference; or that it is at all necessary to awaken their interest and sympathy in reference to those of whom we are writing. If in believing Christianity and building upon it our highest hopes; if in allowing it to mould our inmost characters and influence our daily lives, we are acting a wise and safe part; then those who pursue an opposite course must be acting an unwise and perilous part. Now if so we cannot regard them without solicitude, nor fail to engage in some endeavours to remove the difficulties that stand in the way of their believing. It cannot be supposed that the eleven believing disciples regarded the sceptical Thomas with anything like unconcern. One thing at all events is certain; if they did, their Master did not.

There are *facts* connected with our present inquiry which should be distinctly stated, and which call for consideration on both sides. The first is, that a large number of those who stand in the position of unbelievers, possess only a very imperfect knowledge of true Christianity, and of the manifold and varied lines of fact and thought which tend to maintain its claims. The mediums through which they have looked at revealed religion have been unfavourable. Far from beholding it "majestic in its own simplicity," they have seen it wrapped in the wretched rags of human traditions, and defaced and defiled by Church corruptions. Many have scarcely ever given an hour's earnest and intelligent attention to the evidences of its truth; or deigned to listen to anything that could be said in answer to the arguments by which science, criticism, reason, or prejudice appear to assail it. Their reading and thinking are almost exclusively on the sceptical side. Even where the subject does receive some attention, it is yet to be feared that in many cases it is nothing like as candid and thorough as it should be.

Other facts must be stated with equal plainness. One is this,—that great ignorance prevails among thousands of zealous orthodox believers as to the real opinions of those whom they denominate "infidels." The term infidelity, in the minds of not a few, has but one meaning, that of utter disbelief of all truth pertaining to spiritual and eternal things. Any expression of doubt as to the truth of Christianity, either in its entirety, or in any of its parts, is confounded with atheism, and the doubter is ranked with the fool who says in his heart, "There is no God." I well knew an instance in which the denial of man's natural immortality and the endlessness of future suffering incurred a wide and openly-expressed

Digitized by Google

suspicion that the rejector of these dogmas had become an atheist! Not only among the uneducated members of Christian Churches, but even among many of the better instructed a strange ignorance and confusion of thought may be found in reference to this subject.

In connection with this, unfavourable and often most false opinions are held as to the character of those who do not believe. It is assumed that apart from direct Christian influence there can be no excellence of spirit and no rectitude of conduct; so that the rejection of Christianity implies the possession of a low moral character. In fact, unbelief and evil-doing are almost synonymous terms; and the infidel is branded in the opinion of his believing neighbours as a man of questionable morality.

Again, contrary as it is to the mind of Christ and the genius of his Gospel, it is nevertheless true that much bitterness is frequently felt and expressed towards unbelievers. This in many instances is, doubtless, provoked by the recklessness and profanity with which infidels assail truths dearer to the believer than life itself; in other cases it seems to result from the prejudiced and erroneous views to which we have referred: in all it is inconsistent with meekness and love.

To these facts we must add another of a different aspect, but bearing an important relation to our inquiry. Very many Christians are strangely unacquainted with those evidences of their religion for which intelligent and inquiring minds would ask. Dr. Ellicott supposes the case of believers being suddenly asked why they are Christians, and points out some of the arguments which might be given in reply. We fear that many thousands would not only be found unfurnished with such answers, but with almost every thing which would be likely to constitute a satisfactory "reason of the hope that is in them." Knowing little of the divine and eternal foundations on which Christianity really rests, their faith is too often based as much on sand as rock. Cowper sings of the pious bobbin-weaver who by her own blessed heart experience "knew, and knew no more, her Bible true;" but while this inward witness may be sufficient for our own peace and satisfaction, it can be but a partial and insufficient defence against the assaults of unbelief. Whatever may be the experiences of mind and heart through which the Christian may have passed, or the degree of comfort and assurance to which he may have attained, he may yet have his faith shaken to its foundations by facts and arguments which he hears for the first time, and to which he can give no reply.

In view of these facts our general inquiry might well resolve itself into two particular ones. First,—*How can we best deal with infidelity where it already exists?* and second,—*What can be done to prevent its extension, especially in the professing Church of Christ?* I would briefly suggest a few replies.

I.—Some general knowledge of the subject must be possessed. While the Church contains comparatively few who are competent to

Digitized by Google

grapple successfully with those scientific forms of unbelief which are of modern growth, it has thousands upon thousands of intelligent members who are quite capable of qualifying themselves to meet it in its simpler and more ordinary phases. The chief facts forming the history of our sacred Books should be understood. The leading arguments in proof of the character claimed for them should be studied. It would be well if some of the writers of the last century were better known. Butler, Paley, and others are still capable of important service. There are many modern works too,—cheap and easy of comprehension,—supplying facts and arguments in defence and support of the faith, with which the book-shelves and minds of the Christians of these days should be furnished.

II. In addition to this general acquaintance with the subject, it may often be necessary to study infidelity or doubt as it exists in particular cases. It is surprising how its phases vary with the idiosyncrasies, educational influences, prejudices, and surrounding circumstances of individuals. Scepticism may be quite a different thing in two neighbours, each of whom bears the common name of "infidel." It may consequently require to be dealt with in widely different ways, and what these methods should be it may need some wise care to determine. Happy is it when the Christian can inspire his unbelieving brother with that confidence which will lead him to tell out frankly and clearly the difficulties and doubts of his heart.

III. Opportunities for the use of such knowledge will be readily found, or can be easily made. In the pulpit and the Bible class, in correspondence and conversation, facts, arguments, and suggestions bearing upon these questions might be directly or indirectly employed to overcome unbelief or relieve doubt. There are more minds willing and waiting to be helped than we are apt sometimes to suppose. It is sad when their religious teachers are incompetent to instruct them, or lacking in sympathy. In one instance which came under my own knowledge, a young man joined a Bible class, honestly seeking such information as would satisfy an inquiring mind. To obtain this he asked questions to which his would-be teacher could give no intelligent answers; and sometimes expressed doubts and opinions which sorely disturbed the stagnant orthodox atmosphere of the class, the members of which united with their leader in requesting him to withdraw!* What an opportunity for

* Many readers of the RAINBOW, doubtless, are familiar with the capital story of what took place on a certain occasion in a Sunday-school, related by the Rev. Andrew Jukes in his "Second Death and the Restitution of all Things:"—"The boys in one of the classes were reading the chapter which records how David, as he walked on the roof of his house, saw Bathsheba. One of the boys, looking up through the schoolroom window, at the steep roofs of the houses opposite, after a pause said,—'But, Teacher, how could David walk on the roof of his house?' The teacher, on this point as ignorant as his scholar at once checked all inquiry by saying, 'Don't grumble at the Bible, boy.' Meanwhile the teacher of an adjoining class had overheard the conversation. Leaning over to his

Digitized by Google

usefulness, not only to the inquirer himself but to the whole class, was thus lost through the ignorance and incompetence of one who ought to have been better qualified for the position he held.

IV. In all cases the Christian must *practise candour*. Truth can gain nothing by concealment, dissimulation or sophistry. Aiming at truth not victory,—intent not upon upholding particular forms of Church doctrine, or particular theories of revelation, but seeking to maintain the simple but sublime fact that God hath spoken to us in the Scriptures,—we shall be able to make admissions which will surprise opposers and often in fact silence their objections. Just about the time when Dr. Ellicott was delivering his charge, a Nonconformist minister in the bishop's own cathedral city of Gloucester, was engaged in a course of Sunday evening lectures on certain subjects which the Christian pulpit and Christian press must deal with, and deal with candidly, if infidelity is to be honestly and successfully met. "Interpolated passages in the New Testament," was the subject of one which I had the opportunity of hearing. The lecturer seemed intent only on conserving truth, and consequently made statements and admissions which would be likely to excite the astonishment and alarm of orthodox congregations, but which all biblical scholars would acknowledge to be just and true. As I listened I felt that the right course was being pursued, and one that Christian teachers must more generally pursue in order to disarm infidelity of some of its weapons, and at the same time afford the believer more solid ground for his faith. Principal Tulloch, writing to young men, has well said: "The present must be held to be a time of trial, so far as the faith of the young and the faith of all are concerned. Questions touching the worth and authority of Christianity are widely mooted and openly canvassed. There may be something to alarm,—there is certainly much to excite serious thought in the prevailing bias of religious discussion. Of one thing we may be sure, that it is neither possible to avert this course of discussion, nor desirable to do so. It must have free course. The thought of many hearts must be spoken out, otherwise it will eat within, and the last state will be worse than the first. It may be perilous to have the faith of our youth tried as by fire; but it would be still more perilous to discountenance or stifle free inquiry. Christianity has nothing to fear from the freest discussion. Its own motto is, 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.'"

Human assertion, however vehement,—human authority, however

---

fellow teacher, he whispered, 'The answer to the difficulty is, With man it is impossible, but not with God, for with God all things are possible.'" Mr. Jukes adds: "Such was the solution of the 'difficulty,' too true a sample, I fear, of the way in which on the one hand honest doubts are often met, as though all inquiry into what is perplexing in Scripture must be criminal; and on the other, of the absurdities which are constantly put forth as true expositions of God's mind and word."—W. M.

Digitized by Google

exalted and venerable,—will utterly fail to satisfy the doubts that are awakened, or silence the inquiries that are now so earnestly made. Dr. Ellicott soundly rebukes those who, "resting principally on authority and dogmatic tradition, imagine that their office and mission is not to argue but to teach;" and that they shall best deal with all forms of scepticism by "authoritative declarations" of what they deem the "sound words of truth which have come down from the Apostolic Church." The day for this has gone by. "It seems," says Dr. Tulloch, "a very hopeless thing now-a-days, to try and hold any minds by the mere bonds of authority. The intellectual air all around is too astir for this. There is no system of mental seclusion which can well shut out the young from opinions the most opposite to those to which they have been accustomed. The old safeguards, which were wont to enclose the religious life as with a sacred charm, no longer do so. . . . Religion must approve itself to the young as thoroughly reasonable—in a right sense—as well as authoritative. It must be the highest truth in the light of judgment, and history, and experience."

V. Our aim and testimony cannot be too pure and single. We are to win men to Christ not to Churches: we have to gain them, not to some particular system of dogmas, but to the simple truth of God. While surrendering no truth, and departing from no scriptural practice, we may yet feel it right and necessary to remove some things from our creeds and churches which, while they are not even stepping stones to ourselves, are stumbling stones to others. On the other hand it may be needful for us to accept some truths and follow some courses which may render our principles and practices more consistent with the plain requirements of the New Testament. We cannot over estimate the force of the argument of an intelligent and faithful Christian life. As the believer "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, lives soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" he cannot fail to bear witness to the truth.

VI. Let me add in conclusion that whatever the arguments we use, or the modes of procedure we adopt, either to combat or prevent unbelief, we have need not only of knowledge and candour, but of sympathy and meekness of spirit. One of the several admirable rules which Sale gives for the conduct of Christians towards Mohammedans, is equally applicable to our dealings with all others who differ from us: "We must not give them ill words; but must avoid all reproachful language, all that is sarcastical and biting: this never did good from pulpit or press. The softest words will make the deepest impression; and if we think it a fault in them to give ill language, we cannot be excused when we imitate them." "The servant of the Lord must not strive," says the apostle Paul, "but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves." Words of like import,

Digitized by Google

words eloquent, earnest, and loving, contained in the last section of Dr. Ellicott's charge, may fitly close this series of papers:—

"Whenever we may be called upon to enter into these questions it must not only be with confidence, but with a soul that yearns for the change and conversion of each doubting heart with which it may happen to be brought into contact. Without that deep desire in our souls our arguments will have but little of real persuasive influence. Without sympathy our reasoning will never produce any lasting effect. 'Sympathy!'—some one will perhaps say, 'O much misused word! How is it possible to feel sympathy towards men who are now not only using great powers of mind, and positions of considerable influence, to undermine the belief in revealed religion, but are frequently using a language of bitterness and contempt which may remind us that aversion to those who differ from us is not strictly limited to theology? Is not sympathy in such cases almost a disloyalty towards the Lord who has redeemed us?' No, I venture to answer, it is not. Everything that tends to set forth love for souls can never be otherwise than well-pleasing to Him. And to whom may that feeling more fitly be manifested than towards those who, in all the sad meaning of the words, are alone in the wide world without a Father and a God? Unbelief, however boldly it may speak, is ever at heart unsatisfied and unhappy. There is a void in the soul that never can be filled save with the love and the knowledge of Christ. When we see men like Mill gazing into the rayless night, and striving with every mental power, to find out if poor human philosophy can minister to them any presumption of another life,—any hope of re-union with those loved as their own lives, who had passed into that night and now, it might be, were not—when we see this we forget all their hard sayings, and seek only to bring home the love and Fatherhood of Him who is as yet to them, the Unknown God."

* J. S.

SIMON THE SORCERER.

STEPHEN had been stoned. His faithful testimony had been fearlessly rendered. His sincerity was genuine beyond suspicion, for it was sealed with his blood. If the enemies of Christ did not spare the Leader, we can scarcely expect mercy for his persistent followers. The first blow fell, and took away their Christ. Every man fled to his own, and left him alone. The disciples timidly reassembled, and were strengthened and comforted by the promised gift of the Holy Spirit, when the second blow smote down "a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." The hostile authorities were aroused, and determined to annihilate the troublesome sect. Again the disciples were compelled to flee from Jerusalem, taking refuge in various parts of Judea and Samaria. A virtue was made of

Digitized by Google

their necessity. If they could not dwell in peace at Jerusalem, enjoying Christian communion, they would do what they could towards creating such a society wherever they went. Among those thus driven, and thus minded, was Philip, who fled to the north among the Samaritans. He, with six other men "of honest report," had been appointed to the office of deacon when Stephen was chosen. Possibly their official duties brought them into closer contact with the Jewish authorities, and thus concentrated hostility against themselves. At any rate, the Apostles were able to remain at home through a persecution that cost the Church the life of one deacon, Stephen, and the banishment of another, Philip. For without doubt Samaria was safer than Judea. "Then Philip went down to a city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them." His preaching met with great success. "The people with one accord gave heed" to the doctrines on "seeing and hearing the miracles which he did." The good news of glad things that he taught, confirmed by the miracles wrought, filled the city with "great joy." We are reminded, by their joy over Philip's preaching, of a greater joy they had felt but five years previously, when the Lord himself taught them, tarrying with them two days. Their joy then breaks out with the exulting words, said unto the woman: "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." If asked the question, it would not be safe to deny that Philip's quick and glorious harvest was connected with our Lord's sowing.

When Philip entered Samaria, he found a fertile field, but it was by no means fallow. The very qualities rendering the people open to conviction and quick for action, caused them to be credulous and volatile. Ignorance, coupled, as usual, with superstition, made them the dupes of one wiser and more cunning than themselves. Their Assyrian origin and culture still clung to them, though centuries had intervened, and a monotheistic religion had been imperfectly taught and accepted. The whole world, save the little Hebrew nation, ascribed naturally the occurrence of the unusual to the interference of the gods. Instead of leaving laws that were not understood *un*interpreted, the attempt was made to explain them; thus they were *mis*interpreted. So the Samaritans, burdened with Oriental and budding Gnostic notions, could see in a shrewd charlatan an emanation of God, because he was able to do what they did not understand.

Their poor logic ran thus: This man is able to do what I cannot; if he were a mere man, he could do only what I can; therefore he is more than human,—he is Divine.

The credulous ignorance and ready superstition capable of such logic furnished too fertile a field to be left unworked. And Simon the sorcerer was already there at work when Philip was driven from Jerusalem.

Digitized by Google

If Simon was a native of the country, for which idea there is some authority, his skill in the "black arts" must have been greater than if coming from some distant island, as other writers suggest, because the principle on which the prophet is without honour in his own country would apply with equal severity to a magician.

Simon had been very successful. He had made dupes of the whole people. They were not "bewitched," as the English version renders the Greek, for this would give the idea of reality and genuineness to his performances, but were lost in astonishment, completely amazed, almost dazed. They seemed ready to believe that he could do anything. They received implicitly his lofty pretensions to be "some great one," that is, some one greater than human. All gave heed to him from "the least to the greatest, saying: This man is the great power of God." If we apply the current notions of the day to interpret what the people thought Simon to be, it could not have been less than the belief that he was a manifestation of God. The expression: "This man is the power of God which is called great," is so strong as to permit us readily to believe that many thought him to be an incarnate God—the very God himself. Elsewhere, and but a few years later, Paul was worshipped as a god who had come down among men. From all that appears to the contrary, we may regard the Samaritans, in their treatment of Simon, as implying but a slightly lighter shade of credulity than the Lycaonians displayed in their attempted treatment of Paul. But whether considered as God himself, or his angel, to him they had regard because that of long time he had overwhelmingly astonished them with sorceries.

We do not know in what particular department of the magic art Simon was most skilled. His success shows him to have been no apprentice, and suggests the command of fertile resources. The most impressive forms of magic prevailing then have survived to our day. Incantation is one form, and is the utterance of mystical words supposed to have been learned from some mysterious volume, or to have been extorted from spirits by potent spells. Another form is that of enchantmant, by which freedom of action is lost, and one is irresistibly bound by charms to serve another's uses, or another's malice. A third form is clairvoyance, or second sight; advertisements of which are so common in certain papers, proving that all rogues and dupes are not dead yet. In the methods by which this power of seeing into the future is obtained, ample scope is afforded for the exercise of genius. Thrones, wands, skulls, stars, cabalistic characters, palmistry, ecstasy, frenzy, incantations, and a hundred other means can be used, singly or in combination, to convince the beholder that the awful words he hears are golden prophecy and not tinsel pretence. The most startling and appalling form of all is necromancy. Mysterious power over the living and insight of the future are sufficiently bewildering; but

Digitized by Google

pretended power to cross into the spirit world, and to drag thence the disembodied spirits, forcing them to appear again upon earth, and extorting from them secrets hitherto locked from the living, would perplex and terrify. We should be ready instantly to ascribe superhuman power, and almost ready to pay Divine honours to one really doing this in his own name.

Simon doubtless used some, and probably employed all, of these four species of the black art. "He gave out that he was some great one;" and it is not improbable that he possessed powers, such as mesmerism and "mind-reading" of our day, which he did not understand himself, but which he was none the less able to use. Add to these a deep knowledge of the bad side of human nature, and shrewdness in reading individual weaknesses and foibles, together with a hungry avarice to make the most that he could, and an unprincipled ambition to stand higher than others, and we have the explanation of his remarkable career in Samaria. Out of such poor stuff demagogues and conjurers have been built ever since ignorance and superstition were willing to trust and follow them.

The persecution at Jerusalem was ill-timed for Simon. It sent Philip to the scene of his false victories and sham wonders. Without the mysticism and paraphernalia of the mountebank, or the incantations and weird spells of the necromancer, he performed greater miracles. In the light of day, on the open street, with multitudes thronging him, under the scrutiny of thousands of inquisitive eyes, with the sharp, trained, critical eye of the great Simon himself inspecting, Philip wrought miracles. He did not perform tricks. The people recognised at once the wide difference between Simon's sleight-of-hand and Philip's open-handed wonders. Everybody knew the lame man, who had been hobbling about the streets for years. After Philip had merely touched him, speaking the name of Jesus, he threw aside his crutches, and walked as well as the stoutest. That arm, palsied they did not remember how long ago, "was restored whole as the other" without any preliminary shams, but by the mere utterance of the one "all-prevailing name." Still more astonishing, if possible, was the cure of those possessed with unclean spirits. Incantations most weird, and exorcisms most elaborate, if tried, had produced none effect, when, "crying with a loud voice," they fled before the presence of Philip, strong only in that simple name of Jesus. Simon was deserted. From "somebody" he suddenly became nobody. The people found in Jesus Christ a substitute better than Simon for "the power of God which is called great." And "when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women."

Simon himself was completely taken aback. Things that he had only pretended to do, and things that he had never dared attempt, were really done by Philip. He believed also. He could not help it. Eye and ear again and again rendered their incontrovertible

Digitized by Google

testimony. Philip was a greater magician than he, there could be no doubt about it, and plied a more powerful spell. He was not unwilling to perfect his art by learning Philip's secret. He really believed in Philip and that *talismanic* name which was used. And this was the extent of his faith—a faith in no sense to be termed Christian. It was a mere blind belief in the exercise of superhuman powers by an officer of the sect recently started at Jerusalem. Philip preached more than this, and Simon was understood as professing more. But the repentance and forgiveness, the purity and love of the Gospel, did not touch him. He respected and sought only the brilliant and wonder-working dynamics of Christian faith. He was willing to be a Christian that he might become more of a magician. The Samaritans wanted to become Christians; he wanted to become a sorcerer. As conscience grew, they wished to be good. He was ambitious to be great.

"Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done."

While these events were occurring in the country of Samaria, reports of them came to the apostles at Jerusalem, who sent a deputation of two, Peter and John, to test and aid the good work; perhaps also to convey apostolic sanctions. They found on their arrival a grand work of grace in progress, but unaccompanied by the extraordinary endowments of the Holy Spirit. None of the new converts had as yet received the gift of inspiration or the power of working miracles. Prayer was offered and answered. "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received, or were receiving, the Holy Ghost," when Simon breaks in upon the solemn ceremony with his sacrilegious proposal.

Money was his standard of valuation. He had sold himself for it by following his disreputable and dishonourable calling. During every day of his life as a sorcerer, hopes and fears, the most solemn and sacred, had been trifled with for the money he could wring from those who confided in his pretensions. He looks on and sees powers freely given away that far excelled his utmost skill. Eagerly, greedily he waits his turn until his avaricious spirit will brook restraint no longer. He attempts to drive a bargain with the apostles for the sale of the use of the Holy Ghost, saying: "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost." The request is not confined to powers similar to those conferred by the Apostles through prayer upon others, but with unhallowed step climbs to the level of apostleship, seeking to equal them. Simon seeks not only the gift of power to perform miracles, but also the ability to confer this power on whom he would. This power, he thought, might be had in exchange for his unclean pelf.

It is no wonder that impetuous Peter indignantly repelled him in flaming speech. "Thy money perish with thee, because thou

Digitized by Google

hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God." Though justice flashes angrily with threatening destruction, yet mercy's pleading voice is heard. "Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."

The first and last favourable sign that the abashed sorcerer gives is in his response to Peter's exhortation. He asks the Apostles to pray for him. In the feeling that their prayers may avail in appeasing the high power whom he has offended, when his might fail, we meet with the first bright spot in Simon's character. The request is of a low order, to escape punishment, to avert calamity; but, if sincere, it is as high as could be expected from a life of deceit and hypocrisy. Such characters when threatened with the sharp judgments of God, cower and quiver with terror at the almighty arm outstretched to strike. Sin must crush them by sheer weight before its uncleanness offends them. Simon is brought to the most critical point in his career. His sin has found him out. He is humiliated enough; but is he humble? The proud, strong man, who but a few days ago was thronged by admiring crowds and almost worshipped, stands stripped of his finery, deprived of his pretence, exposed in his hypocrisy, denounced in his servility, and urged to repentance. Bad as the man was, bad as he may be, these strokes must sting as they smite him. Their cumulative force must crush him. He, formerly "the power of God which is called great," now an abject man, in tones of terror beseeches the apostles to pray for him. Could exposure be more complete, humiliating, and crushing?

The Scripture leaves Simon here. We know nothing more about him. The silence is full of awe. We cannot tell whether Simon plunged deeper into the shadow or crept towards the larger light.

Tradition continues him in his bad course, lifts him into court circles, leads him to Rome, surrounds him with power and wealth, and exalts him into a god; but tradition is too vague and shadowy. Simon the sorcerer shall have the benefit of any possible doubt. It is better for him, and safer for us, to go no farther than what is written. No more of his career than is given is needed to teach the danger and crime of cherishing a "heart" that "is not right in the sight of God." No worse a life than his is needed to measure the plenteous forgiveness that waits on repentance. God's mercy is offered to the chief of sinners. If he will, Simon the sorcerer can become Simon the saint, by the grace of God.

J. R. D.

Digitized by Google

WHAT SHALL I SAY?

SHALL I say when storm-clouds lower,
Father, save me from this hour?
Yet to bear this hour I came;
Father, glorify Thy name!

Shall I say in sore dismay,
Father, take this cup away?
Let me add, then, like the Son,
Father, may Thy will be done!

I would say, when breaks the shower,
Father, save me from this hour!
Yet since Thou didst send the same,
Father, glorify Thy name!

I would say, in conflict's day,
Father, take this cup away!
Yet, since thus my crown is won,
Father, let Thy will be done!

I would mourn, when griefs devour,
Father, save me from this hour!
Yet since Thou my trust doth claim,
Father, glorify Thy name!

I would sigh, when friends betray,
Father, take this cup away!
Yet since Thou the faithful One
Bidest,—let Thy will be done!

I would cry, when foes have power,
Father, save me from this hour!
Yet with Him who overcame,—
Father, glorify Thy name!

I would pray, in death's dark day,
Father, take this cup away!
Yet since thus is heaven begun,
Father, let Thy will be done!

Thou, God, didst not save with power
Jesus from his destined hour;
But Thy voice from heaven forth-came,
Prompt to glorify Thy name.

Thou didst mutely let him pray,
"Father, take this cup away;"
But an angel helped Thy Son,
When He said, "Thy will be done!"

Yea, since all things work Thine aim,
Father, glorify Thy name!
Since Thou art the All-wise One,
Father, let Thy will be done!

* H. L. M. (Author of "Angel Visits.")

Digitized by Google

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

ARTICLE III.

AS the reader has perused the contrasted passages given in our last article, he will have observed that the differences between them are absolute. The unloveliness of the human is in the New Testament superseded by the loveliness of the Divine. Without graduation the ethics of religion take a mighty leap heavenward, leaving the natural man and the Jew who remained in the Law at a mighty depth below.

Theories about progressive revelations, each preparatory to the other and given just as man was prepared to receive them, are completely unverified. Not development but a new departure appears here, with no connecting link attaching the teaching of the one to the other.

This view, which as regards the treatment of enemies is undoubtedly correct, must receive qualifications if the whole scope of Old Testament doctrine is contrasted with the whole scope of the New. The command to love our neighbour as ourselves, which is infinitely more difficult than to love the Lord our God with all our soul and with all our strength, and which anticipates the highest teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, was given under the law; and in the predictions of judgment to come upon the wicked, which abound in the New Testament, we have reappearances of God in the style of the old economy.

But in each case these incongruous elements of completely different dispensations are recognised as such. They are, in either case, not the rule but the exception; they do not reveal the separate characters of the dispensations, but heighten them by contrast. A simile may help us and suggest also a profound truth. As Moses put a veil over his face, so of necessity the Godhead in coming down to visit his children, whose spiritual insight was weak and small, veiled the excessive glories of his character in dispensations altogether inadequate to reveal him truly; for as yet the Spirit which quickens and reveals, and gives to man the eagle eye, was not given—in the measure in which it was afterwards poured out and remains. Now as the orb of day is frequently enveloped in veils of cloud, fold on fold, the darker outer veil having rents through which the brightness of the inner shines luminous; so in the Old Testament we catch glimpses of what was hereafter to be revealed in greater measure in the New; and again, as the dark outer veil rolls away but leaves patches of itself upon the glorified nearer cloud, so in the New Testament we find remnants of the character which belonged to the dispensation passed away. That neither one nor the other is a complete revelation of the character of God, we as firmly believe as that outer and inner veils of cloud are not the sun itself. The time will come when the Godhead will be revealed in all its naked glory, to eyes which then shall not be blinded by it, and then will it be demonstrated that in him is no darkness at all.

It is not suggested that there is a spot upon the altogether perfect glory of Christ, but that in the writings which reveal him as the adorable centre of a new dispensation there is much which appears in violation of its and of his essential character,—reappearances, as it were, of the God of the Jews, as he was apprehended by Psalmists and Prophets,

Digitized by Google

eclipsing here and there the ineffable brightness of him who showed us the Father in himself the Saviour and the Light of the world.

Let us not either mistake the real significance of the most fearful of the Imprecatory Psalms. The key to the 109th is found in the following words: "Because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart. As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him: as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually." It is loathing of the soul which is unmerciful, which oppresses the afflicted, which delights in cursing rather than in blessing,—it is divine resentment against sin, holy wrath against the sinner, which is here outbreathed, and in its measure it is a true representation of the Divine reality in the mind of God and of God's children.

For the hater of hate is but the obverse of the lover of love, and, eliminating man from consideration, it is possible to believe in the righteousness of being cruel to the cruel. David believed in it, not eliminating man, but with special reference to man and man's innocent posterity. The Jews of his day believed in it. The Imprecatory Psalms were level with their plane of spiritual attainment and insight. They knew no Saviour and no Gospel making them a hideous contrast. They deemed themselves to be walking in the light of God when they loved their friends and hated their enemies, and were cruel to the cruel. But at last One came—the desire of many hearts, which had long since outgrown the measure of spiritual apprehension that David had attained to, and were wondering and waiting for the blessed Hope of Israel, internally vexed to deadly soul-sickness with the difficulty and inadequacy of that which had been revealed. *He* came, and not only answered expectation but completely surpassed it,—"I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." Just otherwise than David prayed—pray ye! What then? Does the new Teacher confound moral distinctions, dull the edge of conscience, and ask of us the impossible feat of loving our spiritual negatives? No; but he asks us to love him, and loving him we can view man as he does. For it is the love of him which brings us all upon one spiritual level, and compels Paul to say, "It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, *of whom I am chief*." And our guiltiest brother, who is most deformed and loathsome, and who has done us most despite, being seen to be no worse, no less worthy of the great salvation than ourselves, we count him not an enemy, but an *alter ego*,—and we pray for him not as David prayed for his enemies, but as we in the mind of Christ are spontaneously moved to pray: "Have mercy upon him, my fellow sinner, my past self, my *alter ego*,—my self; have mercy upon him in me, upon me in him, upon us miserable sinners." For the salvation of any one of us is, *ipso facto*, a pledge of the salvability of us all.

And not only as the righteous judgment of God brings in all the world guilty before him do we by recognising and confessing this one-

Digitized by Google

ness in guilt come into Christ's mind in respect of sinners, we also enter into sympathy with the difficulties, disadvantages, and untoward conditions of others, in proportion as we raise the standard of attainment for ourselves and are more merciless to our own shortcomings. God's infinite knowledge of the way in which the human soul is morally conditioned may well move him to infinite pity for its misfortunes as well as its faults, and it does so. This unites with his Fatherhood to suggest mercy and forgiveness, and the way thereto, even the sacrifice of himself. To him alone is known the number, the power, the subtlety of man's unseen spiritual foes. To him alone is known the reasons why one should grow up in such a situation as not to be more guilty in becoming a ferocious Turk participating in the massacre of Batak, than a deacon of a Christian church is guilty in selling goods within the shop not the same as the ticketed sample in the window. Christ is not only Judge but Advocate with God, and the power of his pleading is commensurate with his exact and infinite knowledge of the circumstances under which his clients incriminated themselves. Into this mind—not in its fulness—but supplementing our small instinctive conception, we enter with Christ. And when he says, "Love your enemies," we commence to be their advocate, in extenuating their faults and apologising to ourselves for them; perceiving how inferior were their advantages to ours, until instead of bleeding from our injuries, our hearts begin to bleed for the injurers, and we cry out, as dear disciples of Christ, who have learnt his mind and caught his spirit,—"Lord, bless and forgive them, for they know not what they do; and teach them thy way, O Lord, and bring them unto thy likeness."

Now had "David's greater Son," instead of speaking in this language, spoken as David himself in the Imprecatory Psalms, those who were living in a higher region than the Scriptures given to themselves led up to, would have shrunk back into themselves with bitter disappointment. But the very insufficiency of the old revelation had prepared many hearts in many generations to pray for and expect the new. For it is in the nature of each Word from heaven to beget dissatisfaction with itself as being at once "both a veil and a revelation," and when fed upon leading to a hunger which other manna yet to fall alone can satisfy. Hence, when the higher word was spoken for which so many yearned,—it turned indeed multitudes away, but also drew multitudes of divinely dissatisfied souls after it, in delighted liberty and bondage.

But what saith the commentators all this time? It is the fashion of those who set up to be commentators to begin by disparaging commentators, by which they do their best to discredit themselves. The devout thought of learned and life-long students of the Scriptures must everywhere and always be sought for as diffracted rays of inspiration from God himself, while at the same time there is always liberty to differ even from conclusions most generally accepted, for God has not confined his truth to any particular channels, but as many as seek to learn of him he teaches in different measure, and differently also in different ages of the world.

Bishop Horne converted all the imprecations of the Psalms into predictions merely, by converting an optative mood into the future tense. The Psalms, so read, make the wishes of David become the

Digitized by Google

intentions of God, and stretch out their fulfilment beyond this life into the next.

Bishop Horsley attempted nothing of this kind, but translated *sheol* everywhere as hell, thus lending his sanction to the errors of the Authorised Version.

The profound spiritual insight and beautiful perception of Delitzsch, appears to us to approach nearest to a correct appreciation of the true place and value of the imprecatory Psalms in the scheme of revelation; but the readers of the RAINBOW will perceive how much the "old theology" has to do with his laboured and unsatisfactory explanations.

"But as to the so-called imprecatory Psalms," he says, "in the position occupied by the Christian and by the church towards the enemies of Christ, the desire for their removal is certainly outweighed by the desire for their conversion: but assuming that they will not be converted, and that they will not anticipate their punishment by penitence, the transition from a feeling of love to a feeling of wrath is warranted in the New Testament (e.g., Gal. v. 12); and assuming their absolute satanic hardness of heart, the Christian even may not shrink from praying for their final overthrow, &c.; and every wish that judgment may descend upon those who oppose the coming of the Kingdom of God is cherished even in the Psalms on the assumption of their lasting impenitence. (*Vide* vii. 13; sq. cix. 17.) When however, as in Psalm lxix. and cix., the imprecations go into particulars and extend to the descendants of the unfortunate one and even on to eternity, the only justification of them is, that they flow from the prophetic spirit, and for the Christian they admit of no other adoption, except as, reiterating them, he gives the glory to the justice of God, and commends himself the more earnestly to his favour."*

And again:—

"Psalms viii., xxxv., lxix., cix., form a fearful gradation. In Psalm cix., the old expositors count as many as thirty anathemas—paroxysms of a desire for revenge? (1 Sam. xxv. 10, sq.: but 1 Sam. xxv. 32, sq., a gentler stirring up of his conscience sufficient to dissuade him from it.) How much more natural (also Kurtz) that the preponderance of that magnanimity peculiar to him should have maintained its ascendancy in the moments of the highest religious consecration in which he composed his Psalms! . . . the duty of love towards one's enemies, however, is so little alien to the Old Testament (Exod. xxiii. 4, sq.; Lev. xix. 18; Prov. xx. 22; xxiv. 17; xxv. 21, 22; Job xxxi. 29, sq.), that the very words of the Old Testament are made use of in the New to indicate this law. And from Psa. vii. (Saul) we have seen that David was conscious of having fulfilled this duty. All the imprecatory words in these Psalms come therefore from the pure spring of unself-seeking zeal for the honour of God.

"That this zeal appears in this instance as zeal for his own person and character arises from the fact that, standing in antagonism to Saul whom God had rejected, to his mind the cause of God, the continuance of the church, and the future of Israel, coincide with his own destiny. The fire of his anger is kindled at this focus (so to speak) of the view

* Vol. i., pp. 74, 75. (Clark.)

Digitized by Google

which he has of his own position in the course of the history of redemption. It is therefore a holy fire, but the spirit of the New Testament, as Jesus himself declares in Luke ix. 55, is in this respect nevertheless a relatively different spirit from that of the Old. That act of divine love, redemption, out of the open fountain of which there flowed forth the impulse of a love which embraces and conquers the world, was then as yet not completed; and a curtain then still hung before eternity, before heaven and hell, so that imprecations like lxix. 20, were not understood even by him who uttered them, in their infinite depth of meaning. Now that this curtain is drawn up the New Testament faith shrinks back from invoking upon any one a destruction that lasts: and love seeks, so long as a mere shadow of possibility exists, to secure everything human from the perdition of an unhappy future—a perdition the full meaning of which cannot be exhausted by human thought. In connection with this, however, there remains one important consideration. The curses which are contained in the Davidic Psalms of the time of Saul's persecution, are referred to in the New Testament as fulfilled in the enemies of Jesus Christ. (Acts i. 20; Rom. xi. 7, 10.) One expression found in our Psalm, *ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν* (cf. lxix. 5), is used by Jesus (John xv. 25) as fulfilled in himself; it appears as though the whole Psalm ought to be, or may be, taken typically as the words of Christ. But nowhere in the Gospels do we read an imprecation used by Jesus against his own and the enemies of the kingdom of God. David's imprecations are not suited to the lips of the Saviour, nor do the instances in which they are cited in the New Testament give them the impress of being his direct words: they are treated as being the language of prophecy by virtue of the Spirit, whose instrument David was, and whose work the Scriptures are. And it is only in this sense that the Christian adopts them in prayer. For after the pattern of his Lord, who, on the cross prayed, 'Father, forgive them,' he desires that even his bitterest enemies may not be eternally lost, but, though it be in *articulo mortis*, that they may come to their right mind. Even the anathemas of the apostles against Judaising false teachers and against Alexander the smith (Gal. i. 9; v. 12; 2 Sam. iv. 14), refer only to temporal removal and chastisement, not to eternal perdition. They mark the extreme boundary where, in extraordinary instances, the holy zeal of the New Testament comes into contact with the holy fervour of the Old Testament."

Perowne—the latest, and the most distinguished of the English commentators—says of David's imprecations: "Such language is certainly very different from anything that we meet with in the New Testament; and yet if it is not legitimate, if we may not use it ourselves, then how can it be said to be given by inspiration of God?" He goes on to say that the mind of Arnold found refuge from the "real difficulty" in a non-natural interpretation, referring the language to the enemies of our soul's peace,—but that "the gulf is too wide between the original sense and the attempted application." He clearly proves that Bishop Horne is wrong in making the imprecations predictions. "The verbs are optatives, not futures;" and in his note to the 35th Psalm he finds the explanation in the statement that the older dispensation was in every sense a sterner one than the new. The spirit of Elias, though not an evil spirit, was

Digitized by Google

not the spirit of Christ. (Luke ix. 55.) The Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them. Again, the Old Testament saints longed to see the righteousness of God manifested. It could be manifested, they thought, only in the evident exaltation of the righteous and the evident destruction of the wicked here, &c. &c. The awful things of the world to come were to a great extent hid from their eyes. Could they have seen them, then surely their prayer would have been, not "Let the angel of the Lord persecute them," "Blot them out of thy book;" but rather, with him who hung on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

In reference to this note, in another place, he says, "Surely there is nothing in such an explanation which in the smallest degree impugns the Divine authority of the earlier Scriptures. In how many respects have the harsher utterances of the legal economy been softened down by 'the mind that was in Christ Jesus.' How much of it is declared to be antiquated, even though it still stands for our instruction in the volume of the Bible. Our Lord does not condemn Elijah for his righteous zeal,—He does forbid the manifestation of a like zeal on the part of his disciples. As in the Sermon on the Mount he substitutes the moral principle for the legal enactment, so here he substitutes the spirit of gentleness, meekness, endurance of wrongs, for the spirit of fiery though righteous indignation. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, but it is inferior to it."

The valuable suggestions of "T. W," in that most excellent article on the "Servile Interpretation of Scripture" in the RAINBOW for November 1876, must be deferred for consideration till our next paper.

* HENRY DEACON.

(To be continued.)

PARAPHRASED PROPHECIES.

III.—DANIEL'S VISION OF THE RAM AND HE-GOAT AND OTHER PRECURSORS OF THE "KING OF FIERCE COUNTENANCE."

Daniel viii.

TWO years after Daniel saw the vision of the four great beasts, it was given him to see this. He was in the palace at Shushan, which was in the province of Elam, and not far from the border of Babylonia. The place is north of the Persian Gulf, and near the border line separating the present kingdoms of Persia and Turkey in Asia.

And Daniel said:—I was by the river of Ulai, and saw a vision. And I heard a man's voice over the river which called and said, "Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision." So Gabriel came near where I stood and said, "Understand, O son of man, that the vision is for the time of the end. Behold I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation; for the end shall be at the appointed time."

And this was the vision:—

I saw before the river a ram which had horns; and the horns were

Digitized by Google

high—one higher than the other and the higher came up last. And the ram was pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts could stand before him, nor deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great.

And an he-goat came swiftly from the west, having a notable horn between his eyes; and he ran close unto the ram in the fury of his power, and being moved with choler, smote him, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, he was cast down and stamped upon, and there was none to deliver him.

And the he-goat became very great; but when he was strong the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceedingly great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And he made war against the host of heaven, and cast down some to the ground, and stamped upon them. And by him the daily sacrifice was taken away and the sanctuary of the Prince of the host cast down. And some of the host, becoming transgressors through corruption and flatteries (xi. 32), stood on his part as he cast down the truth to the ground, and practised and prospered.

Then I heard one ask, "How long the vision of the daily sacrifice and the transgression making desolate for the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?"

And he was answered, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

And this is the interpretation of the vision:—

The horns of the ram are the kings of Media and Persia (the ram being the united kingdom).

And the rough goat is the kingdom of Grecia; the great horn between his eyes being the great king, Alexander of Macedon, who shall overthrow the kingdom of the Medes and Persians. Now as, when that horn was broken, four came up for it, so on the death of Alexander four kingdoms shall be formed out of the conquests by his nation; but they shall not exercise his great power; his dominion being divided to the four winds,—to Egypt, to Syria with Persia, to Thrace with Asia Minor, and to Greece with Macedonia.

And at the time of the end,—that is, in the latter time of these kingdoms, when the transgressors are come to the full,—out of one of these kingdoms (then to be known as Egypt, Persia, Turkey, and Greece) a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up, and become powerful in Egypt, Persia and Syria, and Palestine. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power only; for he shall join himself to the Wilful King, and serve him; and with force of arms (xi. 31) on his part shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, shall take away the daily sacrifice, and place the abomination that maketh desolate. And he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practise, and destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause the craft of the Wilful King to prosper; and while magnifying himself in his heart, he shall by peace destroy many: he shall also stand up with

Digitized by Google

the Wilful King, as one of his ten subject kings, against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told of the duration of these wonders for two thousand three hundred days is true; but the vision is shut up; it shall not be understood nor come to pass for many days.

IV.—DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY SEVENS OF YEARS TO THE CUTTING OFF OF THE MESSIAH, AND THE AFTER DESOLATIONS UNTIL THE END.

NOW it was fifteen years after the vision of the evening and the morning, and in the first year of the reign of Darius the Mede, that I Daniel understood by books the end of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

So I set my face toward the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes: and I prayed, and made my confession, and said:—

"O Lord, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain; and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. O my God, incline thine ear and hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not to restore Jerusalem, O my God, for thine own sake; for thy city and thy people are called by thy name."

And whiles I was presenting my supplications before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God, the man Gabriel being caused to fly swiftly, touched me, and said:—

"O Daniel, thou art greatly beloved; therefore I am now come forth to make thee understand the matter, and consider the vision. The end of the *seventy years* in which thy people were appointed to serve the king of Babylon is now nigh at hand; and the nation of the Chaldeans will be punished for their iniquity, and their land given to perpetual desolations (Jer. xxv. 11, 12). But as for thy people and thy holy city, *seventy sevens of years* are determined and appointed to finish their transgressions and to complete their sin: then shall reconciliation be made for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness: and the vision and the prophecy shall be closed with the anointing of the Most Holy.

"Know therefore and understand, that from the time of the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build again Jerusalem unto Messiah (the anointed) the Prince shall be seven sevens of years, and threescore and two sevens of years: in the first period, though many troubles will occur, the city, both street and walls, shall be built; and after the end of the second period, the threescore and two sevens of years, shall the Messiah be put to death, and receive nothing (no kingdom as yet).

"But the Lord will renew and confirm his covenant with many during the seventieth seven years in the midst of which the Messiah will be cut off, thus completing and fulfilling the purpose which the sacrifices and oblations foreshadowed.

"And the city and the sanctuary shall be destroyed by the people and

Digitized by Google

the prince that shall come against them: they shall be overflown as with a flood, and desolations are appointed to the end of the controversy. And the land shall be made desolate for the over-spreading of future abominations, both Roman and Moslem, even until the time of the end, and the afflictions appointed to be poured upon thy people in their desolation shall be finished." G. B. C.

LIFE IN CHRIST.

LORD, it is good sometimes to be too late,
E'en when my mind is set on work for Thee:
Thy love accepts the thought, or small or great,
And my design might mar Thy work in me.

'Twas so when Mary sought where Thou didst lie,
Bringing her spices to that place of gloom:
Just when the early gleaming reached the sky,
Amazed she heard Thy voice outside the tomb.

Outside the tomb! Yes! impotent was Death,
For powerless are his bars on Deity:
He was the servant when Thou gav'st Thy breath,—
As in the Father life, so life in Thee.

Lord, thou hast often cast a ray on me,
When some false hope was fading into gloom;
And now I crave to bring forth fruit to Thee,
As love once brought sweet spices to Thy tomb.

I cannot bring Thee ought that is mine own,
For all my springs of life are fed by Thee:
Once I was dead! Thy soul—Thy life alone
'Twas made atonement between God and me.

And God now saith through Thee I'm justified,
For Thou hast died, and risen from the dead:
Sin's debt is paid, and justice satisfied;
My tree of knowledge Thou—my living bread.

H. BURNETT.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE RATIONALE OF THE DOCTRINE.

PART II.

Current Theories and their Difficulties (continued).

IV. *THE Spiritual-Body Theory.* Relinquishing absolutely all attempts to trace any thread of identity between the material body of the present life and the spiritual body of the resurrection; giving over

Digitized by Google

the former unreservedly and finally to corruption; those who advocate this view of the resurrection maintain that we possess even now, at least in a rudimentary state, the spiritual body of the after life: that it already forms, as it were, the inner garment of the spirit, which, eliminated from the gross material husk of this "outer man," springs forth *at death* in the perfection of its development and powers, as the eternal embodiment of the immortal spirit,—death being thus at once the inevitable and immediate antecedent of resurrection.

Distinctively the doctrine of Swedenborg and the Spiritualists, this theory has now met with much wider acceptance, being substantially taught if not explicitly avowed by many orthodox theologians. Thus, for example, Mr. J. Baldwin Brown, in his noble volume of sermons on *the Higher Life*, writes as follows in reply to the question, "What is the doctrine of the Resurrection? "The image of the butterfly, of which so much is made as suggestive of the Resurrection, is valuable chiefly for its vividness and beauty. Far deeper and truer is the image of the seed, which the apostle developes with great fulness in this wonderful passage (1 Cor. xv.), which we read out by our new-made graves, where we realise as we read it our victory over death. The Scripture teaches us that in this mortal body there is the germ of a purer and more perfect spiritual body; in which the spirit clothes itself and stands up in a world of spiritual beings and things, *when this weary, wasted, worn-out form is laid aside in death.*" He adds: "Just as man has now a body which perfectly equips him for intercourse with men and with things in this material sphere, so it is the purpose of his Creator, *when his discipline here is ended*, to clothe him in a body which will fit him for a more perfect intercourse with the beings and objects of the world which lies behind the veil of death. And the germ of this spiritual body lies buried in this mortal frame; *death disengages it to fulfil its destiny.*" And again, as though to obviate the possibility of misconception: "The decay of the outer man, like the dissolution of the albuminous matter in the seed, is really the nourishment of the spiritual germ, through all the experiences with which it is associated. That germ lies hidden in the flesh of our mortality through what we call life: *what we call death completes the process;* the mere husk or shell within which the spiritual body was forming, is put off with painful struggle and buried away with the dead leaves of autumn; while God giveth the emancipated spirit a body "*as it hath pleased him,*" wherewith to stand up in, and to maintain its relations with the beings and objects of, the celestial sphere. . . The apostle knows nothing of disembodied spirits, bloodless, bodiless ghosts, such as the heathen dreamed of as flitting through the shades. . . . The soul *in dying* drops this shell, this husk of the body that is to be, and which is done with for ever, and *is clothed upon* with a form which gives to it freedom of range through the spiritual sphere."*

Still more fully and definitely is this doctrine stated by Sears, a popular American Unitarian writer, in his *Athanasia: or Foregleams of Immortality:* "Man's resurrection is the putting forth at death of a new existence, just as the decaying seed puts forth the blade. Its decay is necessary in order to release the life and the beauty that were within

* Pp. 358-361. *Italics ours.*

Digitized by Google

its foldings. Death and resurrection describe processes, one the inverse of the other, but the former helping on the latter, and preparing its triumphant way. Our future being is insouled and inurned in our present. The spiritual body is included elementally in our present mode of existence, with its perceptive powers all ready for their enlargement. The soul is not a metaphysical nothing, but a heavenly substance and organism, fold within fold. The material falls off, and the spiritual stands forth and fronts the objects and breathes the ethers of immortality. The future is wrapped up within us, and waiting to be unrolled. Death will not transfer us; it will only remove a hindrance and a veil. We receive with our present being the germ of all that we are to become hereafter. The physical comes first in the order of development, forming a secure basis for all that is to follow, holding it firm, and relaxing its compressure when its function is done. 'First that which is natural, afterward that which is spiritual.' The death of the first is the falling away of exuvial matter, when the life of our life becomes manifest and the spiritual body unfolds all its powers. The worm that crawls upon the ground and prepares its own grave in which to wait for its coming transformation, yet bears on its unsightly form those very prominences which mark the places of gold and silver spangles on the wings of the released and soaring insect. The lines of Rogers, "To a Butterfly," with the alteration of a single word, are a fitting and brief summing up of the doctrine:—

> "Child of the sun! pursue thy rapturous flight,
> Mingling with her thou lov'st in fields of light,
> And where the flowers of Paradise unfold,
> Quaff fragrant nectar from their cups of gold.
> There shall thy wings, rich as an evening sky,
> Expand and shut, in silent ecstasy;—
> Yet wert thou once a worm,—a thing that crept
> On the bare earth, then wrought a tomb and slept.
> And such is man,—soon from this cell of clay
> To burst a seraph in the blaze of day."

Now it must, we think, be confessed that so far as antecedent probability, philosophic completeness, and analogical beauty are concerned, this theory of the resurrection presents a striking contrast to those which we have hitherto considered. Neither reason nor science have any serious objections to urge against it. And therefore, to those who hold the doctrine of a resurrection apart from revelation,—though not without its borrowed light,—no theory is likely more to commend itself. Nevertheless to those who regard the teaching of the Scriptures as finally authoritative on the subject, there must ever be one, and that a fatal objection to it,—if regarded as a complete and exhaustive theory of the resurrection of the dead,—and that is *the impossibility* by any ingenuity *of harmonising it with that teaching* not on this subject alone but on others even more important. That this is the case can easily be shown in several particulars.

Firstly.—This theory of the resurrection completely reverses the Scriptural conception and character of *death*. From Genesis to Revelation death is represented as the punishment denounced against disobedience, the wages of sin, the end of the sinner. "The soul that sinneth it shall die,"—this is God's final and severest judgment, and its awful

Digitized by Google

shadow has rested upon this world since the day that Adam sinned, and will so remain till "Death and Hades" are cast into the lake of fire." (Rev. xx. 14.) Death is the terror of humanity, not its aspiration; its degradation and shame, not its elevation and glory. To man whether civilised or uncivilised, as himself the subject of its infliction, death has ever appeared at once a mystery, a calamity, and an abomination. A mystery on which, apart from revelation, no clear and steady ray of light has ever fallen; a calamity out of which, save from the empty sepulchre of the risen Saviour, no unfading flower of hope has ever bloomed; an abomination in which, even without direct supernatural guidance, man instinctively recognises something more than the mere physical suffering; something which impresses him with a conviction of the truth of the poet's familiar words,—

"It is not all of life to live,
Nor all of death to die."

To say, then, as one of the most recent advocates of this theory, quite consistently, does, "Death is only a further development of life, a process of being, a second birth, a natural transition from one state of being to another:" that "to those who believe in Christ the prospect of the spiritual body irradiates as with a rainbow the couch of death. Death will be to them a birth into true life; a baptism into the chill flood to rise on the sunlit bank; a regeneration; a conversion; a resurrection; an assumption; an ascension."—this is surely to confound death with life; to claim as a blessing what God has pronounced a curse; to make the primal threatening, "Thou shalt surely die"—whose appalling tones the history of a dying world has reverberated in never-pausing thunder—a mere *brutum fulmen;* while it changes that last glorious promise, which is as it were the seal of God on the closing lips of revelation, "There shall be no more death," into the saddest words that ever fell on mortal ears.

Secondly.—It is impossible by any mode of interpretation which we can deem legitimate to harmonise the idea of an individual resurrection of men at death, with those distinct and emphatic statements of the New Testament which represent the resurrection of the dead as taking place in large and clearly defined classes or orders; that of the dead in Christ being, moreover, inseparably associated with the Second Advent of the Redeemer. Thus we find our Lord himself declaring, in language already quoted in another connection, "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up *at the last day.* And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up *at the last day.*" (John vi. 39, 40.) What is the meaning of these twice-repeated words, "at the last day?" Is it possible by any reverent or rational mode of exegesis to identify "*the* last day" (τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ) thus spoken of with the day of each individual Christian's death? If the theory of resurrection at death be true, will it not follow that every day since that of Abel's murder has been a last day to some, the closing day of this dispensation being no more so to those who shall then arise than any other day to those who happened to die upon it? But what "last day"

Digitized by Google

is really intended by Christ is placed beyond question by certain emphatic statements of the apostle Paul. The first that we shall quote, he presents with the utmost solemnity and emphasis as an immediate Divine revelation. "For this we say unto you *in the word of the Lord*, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not *anticipate* those which are asleep.* For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. iv. 15-17.) "The last dry," then, is not the day of the believer's death, but the day of the Lord's advent in glory. And with this agrees another important statement of the same apostle: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But *each in his own order*: the firstfruits Christ; afterward (ἔπειτα) *they that are Christ's at his coming*." (1 Cor. xv. 20-23.) From this passage we learn furthermore, that God's harvest—like the harvests of earth—is to be gathered not in single ears but in mighty sheaves, even as of old the priest waved the "*sheaf* of the firstfruits before the Lord: a type, doubtless, of the first resurrection.

Thirdly.—The express revelations of the inspired Scriptures not only warrant but most strongly encourage us to look forward, as the final result of Christ's redemption, at least in its immediate relation to this our world, to the evolution of "new heavens and *a new earth*," in "the times of restoration of all things, concerning which times God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." But since this "new earth" will doubtless be,—for only on this assumption would such a designation be anything but illusive,—as really *a materialism* as the present earth; the only distinction being that "the creation,"—mark! the same creation in substance though not in form,"—shall then be "delivered from the bondage of corruption" (φθορᾶς), i.e., that irresistible tendency to change and decay of the energies of the material universe which science so strikingly proves to be its present necessity; and included in "the liberty of the glory of the sons of God." Now to this new and glorious materialism, according to the teaching of the New Testament, the resurrection body of the saints will belong. The glorification of nature and of man are mysteriously but inseparably co-related; man answers to nature and nature to man as the mould to the cast or the key to the lock. The new earth without the manifested sons of God would be creation without its crown; the redeemed exiled from the new earth would be as kings without a throne. Hence, however vast may be the range of their emancipated and ennobled energies, this new earth will be their home: for it is not till the New Jerusalem descends from God out of heaven, that the great voice

* "So far were these early Christians from regarding their departed brethren as *anticipating* them in entering glory, (which must needs be the case if resurrection at death were true,) that they needed to be assured that those who remain to the coming of the Lord 'will not anticipate them that are asleep.'"—*Fausset.*

Digitized by Google

proclaims, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them." "And he that sat on the throne said, Behold I make all things new." (Rev. xxi. 3, 5.) But if this be so, it clearly follows that the resurrection body must be material, though not fleshly. A material earth must have material inhabitants. If there is to be a material atmosphere above them; material ground beneath their feet; material objects all around; then the redeemed themselves must partake of the prevailing materialism. And therefore we are forced to the conclusion that, in perfect agreement with the teaching of Scripture itself, the spiritual body, as conceived of by those who hold the theory contested, cannot be itself the ultimate development of the resurrection, though it may be that out of which, or in connection with which, that development takes place.

Lastly.—The express teaching of the New Testament is that Christ's resurrection body is the pattern of ours: that as he rose even so shall we. At the same time, however, these very Scriptures supply an accumulation of evidence to the reality of Christ's resurrection body, as not only visible but tangible, and something very different from an ethereal body; and also to another fact, namely, that his rising took place not at death but upon the third day afterwards. This point has been so well stated by Mr. Edward White, that we gladly quote his language in preference to presenting the argument in our own:—

"The definition of the *resurrection* of Christians is fixed by the definition of Christ's resurrection. The word cannot signify one thing in our Lord's history, something quite different in the case of his followers. The manner in which both Christ and all his apostles closely bind together the fact of his own resurrection, and the hope of theirs, renders it an act of critical violence to attempt to dislocate the two. The sense in which they are to rise again is to be determined by the nature of his resurrection.

"Now if the word *anastasis* stands for the *survival of the spirit*, Christ's *anastasis* occurred on the day that he died; when he went and preached to the spirits in prison."

"But Christ's *anastasis* occurred *on the third day*. And hence we conclude that the resurrection of Christians is not the survival of their souls, but their rising up to life, in bodies which shall be "given" them. St. Paul bases his hope of the *anastasis* of Christians wholly on the *anastasis* of Christ 'on the third day' (1 Cor. xv.), and hence we may be as certain as we can be of anything that depends on criticism, that Professor Bush, Mr. Jukes, and their associates, are here engaged in a conflict with the apostles."*

It will not weaken this argument, we venture to think, but on the contrary not a little strengthen it, if we substitute the word ἐγείρω for ἀνάστασις, inasmuch as the former word and not the latter is, as Dean Stanley notices,† almost invariably used by the writers of the New Testament to denote Christ's resurrection. Even in the passage in 1 Cor. xv., which our honoured friend has partially quoted, the word used is not *anastasis* but *egiro*, nor indeed does Paul ever employ the word

* "Life in Christ" second edition, pp. 352, 353.
† "St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians," second edition, p. 311.

Digitized by Google

anastasis in reference to Christ's resurrection on the third day.* That Christ's *egíro*, however, took place *on the third day* the Scriptures most distinctly and repeatedly assert. And this, as we understand it, is the real point at issue; for *egíro*—as the more specific word than *ana tasis*—denotes, we apprehend, the *materialisation* of the body of the *anastasis* previously in existence. We are prepared to admit that the *anastasis* attains its initial stage at death, but we also contend, as against the holders of this theory simply, for the *egíro* as essential to the scriptural conception of resurrection. *Egiro* is included in *anastasis*, but may be clearly distinguished from it. Now the *egíro* in the case of Christ did not take place till *the third day*; it will not take place in the case of the saints till *the last day*. But of this more hereafter.

We have thus, if we are not unduly confident, swept clear the stage. The work of demolition is complete. In our next paper it will behove us to attempt to build anew.†

Florence Villa, North Finchley. W. MAUDE.

THE DEATH OF THE BODY NOT THE EXTINCTION OF THE SOUL.

PART II.

(Concluded from page 231.)

OUR friend appears restless at "the variety of passages pleaded" by me "in support" of the partial survival of man upon the dissolution of his body at the first death. I think it must be very apparent that if life in the spirit after bodily death be "well established," there is great "use" in finding the support of such passages as recognise that life, when contending with those who insist upon the entire extinction of all human life when the body dies. If even the spirit alone of man survive, Mr. Mill's argument is overthrown. And if the dead are in a state of appreciable blessedness, it is very plain that they are in yet conscious personal existence, Mr. Mill's protest notwithstanding. But just such a passage as he desiderates seems actually to present itself in Rev. vi. 9-11. Here the souls of "the dead" are spoken of as "living beings." The seer says, "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain . . . and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they, should be fulfilled." Thus have we an inspired representation of the souls of slaughtered men, crying with a loud voice, away from the earth and distinguishing themselves from the dwellers on the earth, pre-

---

* We can hardly regard Phil. iii. 10 as an exception, as the sense there is plainly "resurrection-life." The verb is once used by Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 14.

† ERRATUM.—In the former paper, p. 107, line 6, after "carbon" insert the word "oxygen."

Digitized by Google

sented with robes, and bidden to rest still until the complement of the slain for Christ's sake should be fulfilled. This Scripture, I hope, Mr. Mill will acknowledge to meet his requirement. These "dead" would "know not anything" of what might be passing on the earth; and yet they are living "with God," as our Lord says all, even the dead, do.

Mr. Mill seems loth to admit that he has mistaken me in respect of the dead from henceforth of Rev. xiv. 13. He might have been convinced however, that he had misunderstood me, when he was led to write, "the actually dead cannot 'die in the Lord from henceforth' (being dead already)." I could hardly have been so obtuse as to contend for the first death being repeated upon the same subjects. And it is complained that I make "the passage read, 'blessed are the dead from henceforth, instead of, blessed are they who die from henceforth." But the prophet's words are, (we will give them in Mr. Rotherham's rendering.) "Write! *Happy* the dead who in [the] Lord are dying, from henceforth." So that my words run pretty well parallel with the prophet's, omitting for the occasion the qualifying limitation, restricting the class of dead ones who are pronounced happy to those who should "die in the Lord from henceforth." Certainly I had no thought of applying the words directly to the past dead. I was simply emphasising the fact that the persons spoken of as dead, are the persons of whom happiness is predicated. Nor is it altogether necessary for my purpose to insist that it is the souls of those dead that are thus happy; though I should not have expected it to be disputed that, if any of the afore-persecuted saints are happy when dead, it is in their souls that they are so happy. I take the "rest" of ver. 13 to be in antithesis to the endurance of ver. 12, and in contrast with the unrest of the worshippers of the beast in ver. 11.

And is it not permissible after all to argue from the particular to the universal? May not "a general principle" "fairly be educed" from "a special case?" I think it is perfectly lawful and right to reason thus. St. Paul himself gives us as remarkable an instance of this mode of reasoning as one would wish to meet with. In 1 Cor. xv, he founds the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead upon the very "special case" of the single resurrection of the incarnate Son of God. Let it be but once established that a true man has been actually, though there be but one known instance, raised from among the dead, and the fact of the possibility of human resurrection immediately becomes credible as a doctrine. The general principle is thus incontrovertibly educed from a special case. And so in the matter before us. If a condition of happiness is predicated of the dead in any special circumstances, it forthwith becomes credible that other holy dead may be in a condition of proportionate happiness. "Whereas the blessedness" here, as Mr. Mill concedes, "pertains only to those in special circumstances," the admission is made that there is blessedness for the dead in some circumstances. For it can hardly be contended that the dead (of course those particular dead, in this instance, that had endured the rage of the wild beast) are not intended, seeing that the inspired divine writes, "Happy! the dead."

And how are these dead specially happy if, as Mr. M. tells us, their "rest" is no better than the "rest" of the worshippers of the beast and his image? "The faithful persecuted ones suffer," he says, ". . . and have no rest," in life, of course. And he will, I apprehend, doubt-

Digitized by Google

less assign the "no rest" of the worshippers of the beast to a period in their lives. And then "death and the grave become the only asylum of rest for either the worshippers of God, or the worshippers of the beast." In what respect then, we fain would know, are the faithful dead, of whom St. John speaks, happier than the rebellious dead? Mr. Mill answers by anticipation, "With regard to this death-rest there is this tremendous difference: 'The sins' of the persecutors 'are open beforehand, going before unto judgment." But this, surely, is not satisfactory. For in this way the difference in the death-rest is really none at all; the persecuted and the persecutors have an equally happy rest. It might, on Mr. Mill's representation of the relation of rest, have been written also of the suffering followers of the beast, 'Blessed are those who die from beneath the chastening of the Lord,' for they too "rest from their suffering."

"But 'blessed are those who die in the Lord,' they rest (unconsciously) from their suffering, but 'their works follow them.' 'Follow them,' . . . not unto death, surely!" So writes Mr. Mill. Now it is not I who make the Scripture say, "for their works do follow with them." For so I find it written in both editions of the Greek Testament that I have by me, in Rotherham after Tregelles, and in Alford. And if this be the correct reading, then the Word of God represents the works of the saints as following with them when they die—not surely to be buried with them in their graves, but much rather as conducing to their conscious happiness in rest in their intermediate state. Thus does the concluding clause read in Mr. Rotherham's translation: "Yes! says the Spirit, so that they shall rest out of their toils, for their works are following along with them." I think, then, that this Scripture vindicates with sufficient clearness the truth of the conscious rest of at least certain of the saints in death. Nor does it admit of the idea of their works overleaping a chasm of time of greater or less extent, during which the saints are themselves out of being. It is in view of the text and of these considerations that we deem "the 'blessedness' to adhere to the saints in their death-state;" and believe that "their works follow them" "into their death-rest" and "beyond." Their happiness will lie, not in the reception yet, but in the anticipation of their reward.

As I do not at all believe that the unjustified wicked will "come forth unto a resurrection of life" (John v. 29); I am relieved of all difficulty in interpreting frankly, literally, and consistently the passage advanced from Rev. xx. 12.*

My "faith" remains "steadfast" in the word of John xii. 25; though I may not have been sufficiently careful in the phraseology I employed to express it. Advantage is taken of an ambiguity in the meaning of the word "keep." Paul would, through Christ, "keep" (retain) his "life through death," whilst he would cease, in his own proper person, then to "keep" (guard) it. Thus do the two statements consistently "agree." The apparent contradiction is not real. He that hateth his life in this world keeps it into life eternal, by deriving life,

* I am happy to acknowledge myself much indebted, for clearing my views on this subject, to some able papers in OUR HOPE, vol. ii., on "The Bodily Resurrection of the Lost," by Fidus.

Digitized by Google

fresh life to his soul, from Christ; and then committing to Christ the preservation of that life through this present stage of being, yea, and onward through the death-stage too. This life is, indeed, to be watchfully guarded by ourselves while living in the flesh, in dependence on the grace of Christ; and then we may lay us down in peace and take our rest, knowing that he will make us to dwell in safety.

Does Mr. Mill imagine that "this passage from John," in its plain obvious sense, is controverted by the parallels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke? In quoting Matt. x. 39, he should have noted that the find of the second clause corresponds with the finds of the first. There it speaks of a life already in possession; and so too plainly may it (and, we say, does it) in the second clause. There is no need to suppose a vast vacuum of being between a man's losing his life for Christ's sake and his again finding it. In the parallel of St. Mark viii. 35, the word is not find but save. And this seems to determine the sense in which the find of St. Matthew is used; the sense in which we think most readers would have understood it apart from the reference, find it=find that he has it. Just so, St. Luke ix. 24, save it. But another parallel in St. Luke (xvii. 33) deserves more special attention. This reads in the Authorised Version, "Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it." The word here used is a very significant one: shall I not say a remarkable one, as bearing on our dispute? Do not the words convey by themselves a sufficiently obvious apparent contradiction? "Whosoever," says our Lord, "shall lose his life (or soul) shall preserve it." Admit that the occasion here again is special, pointing it may be to the very period that Rev. xiv. 13 has relation to; still the principle is no less true than if the words be (as in degree they may be) of universal application. Now if I had used such words, with what indignant reproof, would they have been met! And justly, had we not the support of Scripture to found our faith upon. As they stand, however, they seem to me to "illustrate finely," or rather, strikingly to corroborate John xii. 25, expressing indeed precisely the same truth. So that I am greatly obliged to my opponent for suggesting the parallels. The original of this word shall preserve, *ζωογονήσει*, means more, it will be seen at once, than is thus expressed. It is said to be of frequent use in the Septuagint in the sense of, to preserve alive. And we must take it to mean no less in this place than not to let die, i.e., the soul, which is the subject spoken of. Alford renders the word, shall quicken it, which is more than not to let die; and he cites from Wordsworth an explanation, which is expressed by Rotherham's exact rendering, shall give it a living birth. The loss of life, of soul, to the body, in the case of the martyred saints of Jesus,—so far from resulting in such soul's extinction,—gains for it new living birth! This implies, at the very least, its retention of existence as the soul of man. And that which "shall come forth into a resurrection of life" must needs be in being in order to so come forth.

I am indebted to a RAINBOW contributor, writing elsewhere, for a further, "an unsuspected parallel" to John xii. 25, occurring in the Old Testament Scriptures. In Psa. lxvi. 9 it is written, "Who holdeth our soul in life." This is rendered, after the Septuagint version (where the Psa. is called, "A Song or Psalm of Resurrection,") "Who quickens our soul into

Digitized by Google

life (ζωη)." Bishop Horsley renders from the Hebrew, "Who appointeth our soul to immortality." The doctrine of the Psalmist seems precisely that of the Evangelist, that the soul-life of the saints is merged by God into the life eternal.

As my faith in the Word of God by St. John remains unshaken, so does my hope in the Divine Word by St. Peter continue undisturbed, in spite of the (not, I think, very pertinent) remarks of Mr. Mill; who indeed professes himself to cherish the same "lively hope." And are we really to understand that, though in his "category of things said to have been attained, are these words from Paul, 'but you are come unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem;'" he yet holds that this, in flat contradiction to the words, has not been attained by believers? And that so these words of the inspired writer may be made to negative the positive declaration of our Lord, that he that believeth the Divine mission of the Christ "hath everlasting life?" Is my opponent unmindful that hope is embraced within faith, for "Faith is a confidence of things hoped for," as well as "a conviction of facts that are not seen?" Nor does it at all follow that that which is in the future as a matter of hope's fruition, is therefore necessarily excluded altogether from being in the present as a fact for faith. Do we not come to Jesus by faith now? Indeed, is not faith towards him coming to him? And if he protests to us that we have life by believing, are we to disbelieve that, because we have not yet attained to the manifestation of that life in glory, and to the promised future brilliant abode of that life? If the Lord assures us, in most emphatic present form, of our possession of everlasting life, this is not rendered a false assurance because of the bounteous promises of vastly "more to follow." The prospects of the saints do not destroy their present entrance into life. They already "have approached (in faith) the city of the living God;" and already (in faith, in earnest, and in hope) they have "attained" everlasting life. The Scripture saith, "He that hath the Son hath life," as Mr. Mill quotes in conclusion of his first paper. If it be denied of the second hath that it applies in fact to the present, but alone to the future; plainly the same principle must attach to the first hath, and "he that hath the Son" must mean, he that shall have him. Is this interpretation admissible? Obviously not. But neither is it permissible to interpret, 'He that hath the Son, hath life in God's view and intention, and shall have it hereafter in his own experience.' No; we may by the Spirit have the Son now, and with him the life,—an inalienable gift, for "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

That God "calleth the things that are not as though they were," is no proof that all that is present with God is future for man; and we think it a reckless statement to make, that "almost every page of Scripture bears witness to it." Rom. iv. 17, and Ezek. xxxix. 8 are not precisely parallel cases in point. In the latter the prophet speaks as though himself transported into future time, and thence making his positive announcement, declarative of the fulfilment of the purpose of the Lord God. But in the former instance, which is the passage so much relied on, it was true at the time when it was spoken, that God had made Abraham a father of many nations. That Abraham's fatherhood of the nations required time for its manifestation, does not infringe the truth of the

Digitized by Google

statement when uttered, that God had then appointed (τέθεικα), constituted, made him a father of nations. The declaration of fact here is of the fact of effective appointment. Consequently this is not so positive an instance as claimed of the translating of the future into the present. And are there no present facts for Christian faith? Has faith as yet to do only with things hoped for? That God sees and ofttimes declares "the end from the beginning," no one disputes. And that the Divine Word frequently speaks of events of the future in terms of the present, in order very strongly to signify their certainty, is also fully admitted. But that no affirmation of the holy oracles relating to the spiritual life of man is to be taken as presently true, cannot in anywise be allowed.

Mr. Mill asks what is meant by my explanation that everlasting life is received now subjectively, whilst objectively it cannot of course be yet possessed. Its meaning would have been more obvious to Mr. Mill and to his readers if the quotation had been continued beyond "really means," and included the words, "But I should be understood as connecting the everlasting with the spiritual life, and to mean that the birth of the spiritual life actually takes place while we are in the flesh." And I must further remark that the latter clause of the quotation is separated in my paper by a page of five paragraphs from the former. However, the admission made is no admission that a position previously defended is practically "indefensible." If the distinction between that which is true subjectively, but which does not hold objectively, "seems" to my opponent "a little confusing," one really cannot help that. The distinction is real, and I believe my meaning plain to any one caring to understand it. Though "a free manner of speaking" be not a happily chosen phrase, and has proved provocative of irony, yet what was spoken certainly need mislead no one. As within the range of physical being there is ever life before entrance by birth upon what is usually understood by one's life upon earth; so I contend, without the least inconsistency, that our spiritual life commences before its full development at the outset in resurrection of its strictly eternal career. We are wont to reckon our earthly lives from the date of our birth, without denying a prior quickening; and so the life to come will have had its quickening in time that now is. Nor is there any just ground for believing that this life once quickened will be extinguished, to be rekindled at the morning of the resurrection. "There is not one word in the Bible," says Theodore Monod, "which says or implies that the life which God gives us is an intermittent life." This witness we are confident is true.

And this renders sufficiently plain "what is meant" not "by degrees of 'eternal life,'" but by a degree, a step, of impartation of that life. It is the important "amount" implied in its inception, its rise. So that, as certainly as he that hath Christ hath life now, so certainly he that hath this life now shall keep it into life eternal. I hope this, which is the Word of the Lord as I can but understand it, will be convincing, and that it will be allowed that "the dead in Christ," who are "asleep in Christ," cannot be deemed to be extinct in him, or to "have perished."

"If a man keep my saying, he shall never see (ver. 52, taste of) death." (John viii. 51.)

G. A. HAYWARD.

Digitized by Google

REST WHEN THE LORD COMES.

"To you who are troubled rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven."—2 THESS. i. 7.

AND is there none before? No perfect peace,
Unbroken by the storms and cares of life,
Until the time of waiting for him cease
By his appearing to destroy the strife?
No, none before.

Are we not told that through the flag of grace,
By faithful messengers of God unfurled,
All men will be converted, and the place
Of man's rebellion be a holy world?
So we are told.

Is it not true that to the Church is given
The holy honour of dispelling night,
And bringing back the human race to heaven,
By kindling everywhere the gospel light?
It is not true.

Is this the hope—that Christ the Lord will come,
In all the glory of his royal right,
Redeemer and Avenger, taking home
His saints, and crushing the Usurper's might?
This is the hope.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

[An esteemed correspondent has favoured us with the following, which recently appeared in the *Belfast News Letter*. Its writer, Dr. Nevill, of Dungannon, County Tyrone, is a Christian Physician of high character. His letter will be useful to students.—ED.]

SIR,—In September last the printed programme of a clerical meeting, then about to be held in Belfast, was put into my hand. The subject for discussion was the Greek word "æon" in the morning meeting, and in the evening its adjective, "æonian." I had previously known that this word was frequently used in the Testament, in different modes of expression. I had known, also, that the expressions "for the æons," "for the æons of the æons"—in fact, that many of the modes of expression used in the Testament "are unlike anything that occurs in heathen Greek writers."

Why is this? Why did the New Testament authors use the word in a sense different from classical heathen writers? The reason is obvious. They had to teach things that had never entered into the mind of a heathen. To convey the new ideas they must either coin new words or use old words in new senses. It is the way constantly adopted by the sacred writers and

Digitized by Google

by our missionaries, to use old words in new and altered meanings. To give one instance: John i. 1: "In the beginning was the Word—the Logos." Here our common word "word," and the common Greek word "logos" are used to mean the Son of God. "The Word—the Logos—was with God and was God."

What we want to know, then, is not the meaning by derivation, not the meaning by classical use, but what is the meaning in which the sacred writers use it. Well then, how can we best ascertain that meaning? Or rather, how can we best set about the task to try to ascertain that meaning? Obviously our way is, first, to take down all the modes of expression in which it is used; and, secondly, to find out every place (marking chapter and verse) in which each mode is used; and, finally, to compare *every* context.

I was rather surprised to find that the sacred writers make use of the word "æon" in no less than twenty different modes of expression. I made a list of these different modes, and under each marked down the chapter and verse in every place in which that mode occurs.

No attempt is made in our translation to distinguish these different modes of expression, and yet the word æon is rendered in it by eight or nine different words; and as each of these words has other meanings, the best way is to adopt and use the word æon itself untranslated.

Our word "world," which is often used to render æon, is also given as the translation of three other Greek words. It would give me much pleasure to assist any student of the Testament by furnishing him with these references, and enabling him to study for himself how the sacred writers use this word in *every* context. Let me mention a few of the principal modes in which it is used. We have "before the æons," and "before æonian times."

1 Cor. ii. 7: "The mystery—the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the æons." 2 Tim. i. 9: "His own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before æonian times." Tit. i. 2: "Life, which God that cannot lie promised before æonian times." And as it carries us back to times before the æons, so it carries us forward to the end—the consummation of the æons, *and beyond them*. Dan. xii. 3 (LXX.): "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars, for the æons *and still on*." Christ, Rev. xi. 15: "shall reign for the æons of the æons."

The "King of the æons," 1 Tim. i. 17, formed, Eph. iii. 11, "the purpose of the æons." God by his Son, Heb. i. 2, "made the æons." Heb. xi. 3: "The æons were framed by the Word of God."

We are introduced to several successive æons, especially the Mosaic æon, this present æon, and the coming one.

Of the Mosaic dispensation or æon, how common in the Old Testament is the expression, "It shall be a statute for ever—for the æon."

Then how frequently do we meet with "this present æon?" Matt. xiii. 22: "The care of this æon." Luke xvi. 8: "The children of this æon are wiser." Luke xx. 34: "The children of this æon marry." Rom. xii. 2: "Be not conformed to this æon." 1 Cor. i. 20: "The disputer of this æon." 1 Cor. ii. 6: "The wisdom of this æon." 1 Cor. ii. 6: "The princes of this æon." Gal. i. 4: "This present evil æon." Eph. vi. 12: "Rulers

Digitized by Google

(cosmocrats—world-rulers) of the darkness of this æon."

Matt. xii. 32; Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30; Eph. i. 21; Heb. vi. 5: "The coming æon." Luke xx. 35: "Worthy to obtain that æon." Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30: "And in the æon to come æonian life."

To me there seems to be a chain of æons—every æon—every link framed and fitted (katertisthai, Heb. xi. 3), stretching back further than geology into the past eternity, and reaching forward to perhaps an equally remote goal in the future. Psa. lxxviii. 41: "They limited the Holy One of Israel." We ought not to follow the bad example.

I briefly mention these to show how much there is to be learned about this word, and which cannot be traced in our translation; and now, in the concluding words of St. Jude, ver. 25: "To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, before every æon, and now, and for all the æons. Amen." W. NEVILL.

AN EVASION.

DEAR SIR,—An earnest man rises in a public meeting, and says:—

"I am convinced that clear teaching on the subject of the Saviour's Second Advent is much needed in the pulpit. That blessed hope was prominent in the ministry of the apostles. It is sadly neglected in these days, and the substitute for it of the mere human notion of a converted world through the preaching of the gospel, has obscured the light of truth to a mournful extent."

The speaker was a "layman." He was followed by a "minister" who, instead of applauding him for having the courage of his convictions, said:—

"I have no sympathy with the sentiments of the gentleman who has just spoken. We must preach the gospel, and do what we can for the people with the help of education and science. But of course as to the Second Coming of the Lord, we all believe that. We all believe that he will come again in great power and glory."

This is simply a specimen of the way in which a sublime and joyful revelation is dealt with by many preachers who would think themselves libelled by the suggestion that they are not in doctrinal sympathy with the Apostles of Christ. To say that "We all believe that Christ will come again," is simply an evasion, and they know it. This not the "presence"—παρουσια—of their beloved Lord and Life, for which the first Christians looked as their crowning joy and the consummation of their highest hopes; and the sooner we all return to apostolic doctrine, and abandon our miserable theological traditions, the better for the Church and the world. What the RAINBOW has done to restore primitive truth, on this and kindred subjects, is beyond all praise, and should be recognised by a greatly increased circulation of the Magazine.

I am, yours sincerely,
AN OLD DISCIPLE.

THE TEN VIRGINS.

SIR,—Observing an analysis of the Parable of the Ten Virgins in this month's issue, allow me to refer your readers to a paper of mine on this subject published in the RAINBOW of November, 1868 (Vol. v.).

In doing so, I have *really* no motive beyond obedience to the command to "prove all things," in order to the manifestation of

Digitized by Google

TRUTH. The parable is an important one, but has both by pulpit and press been so strangely dealt with that a *popularised* interpretation as having reference to the present age has obliterated the scriptural instruction regarding a peculiar phase of the future kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

H. GOODWYN.

Wellington House,
Clevedon, Somerset.

THE SPIRIT.

DEAR SIR,—I am sorry to have again to correct a misrepresentation of my opinions which Mr. Hobson has made in his letter in the RAINBOW of May last. I must really say that I will feel obliged if Mr. Hobson will read what I have written before he undertakes to represent my opinions to the public. I cannot think that he would misrepresent me so seriously as he has done if he had read my works.

At page 237 Mr. Hobson says that I "deny the continued living existence of Paul's spirit" in the intermediate state. This is what I have never done. I have always taught the exact opposite. I have not taught that the spirit of man is an entity or person either during man's lifetime, or in the intermediate state; but I have always maintained that it was, and must be, a living principle, as much when God withdraws it from man in death as when it abides in man and thereby makes him a living soul. I will merely refer to page 45 of my second edition of "Hades" in proof of this. There, speaking of the spirit during the intermediate state, I say of it, "We do not deny the *incorruptibility and immortality* of the spirit in man." Passages of a similar sense abound in my writings, while I venture to say there is not one which justifies Mr. Hobson's extraordinary statement as to what I hold.

HENRY CONSTABLE.

FINAL SALVATION OF THE HUMAN FAMILY IN ITS ENTIRETY.

DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly permit me to say a few words in view of one or two things which I observe in the RAINBOW of this month: and though what I say may appear somewhat egotistical, yet I trust that it may not on that account be unprofitable.

I was myself brought up, as by far the greater number of professing Christians have been, in the full belief of the doctrine of eternal torment in hell; and having received the doctrine as a part of divine truth, I was never for a single moment troubled with any doubts or questionings upon that subject. It was, however, my happiness to have learned from my father, with whom I served the early part of my ministry, to think freely, boldly, and independently.

But though not troubled with doubts on the subject of eternal sufferings, I felt unable to accept the teaching of my earlier days on some other points, e.g., the manner of the forgiveness of sins, and the *immediate* entrance after death upon an eternity of suffering in hell or of blessedness in the immediate presence of God.

Now as a teacher, by profession, of divine truth, I could not be content without going to the fountain-head of all knowledge for a solution of my difficulties; I mean to the Word of God and to prayer.

And may I say that, in humble reliance on teaching thus gained, and with undoubting trust that the

Digitized by Google

Father whom I loved, and to whom alone I looked for guidance, would lead me to all truth, I believe that I have found the solution of many a doubt and difficulty. Years ago I was led—I believe by this same teaching—to see how it was needful that Christ should be the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world: for it seemed to me that, except in view of the future atonement on the cross, and the future union of Christ with the human family, the sentence "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" must have been accomplished at once, man must have been blotted out of creation, and God's purposes of redemption, so far as man is instrumentally employed in them, would have been defeated. I saw this while at the same time I was holding the so-called orthodox view of hell. But in due time God showed me more, and, as I believe, Himself led me to see that as Christ has been made the last Adam—the new Head of the human family—so through him, and him alone, life would reach to the whole family: and thus the works of the devil would be destroyed.

Permit me to observe, in passing, though it is wandering slightly from the purpose of my letter, that if the works of Satan be the causing of death—for death is his strength and power—then for God to inflict eternal death seems to be rather building up and aiding than destroying the works of Satan, and bringing him to nothing.

Now, dear Sir, what I want to point out is this: that I have been troubled by no doubts about the eternity of punishment—that I have been influenced by no human teaching—that I have gone to my Father in heaven, with a simple belief that he would not allow a child that trusted his love to go wrong, and that he has given me grace to overthrow many old prejudices for the sake of his truth—that I am indifferent to what you call the Pagan doctrine of the deathlessness of the human soul, and only care for the union of Christ with the human family—and yet that I hold the final salvation of that family in its entirety.

And now I find in your pages this view characterised as a "huge error," entertained because eternal torment is denied and human deathlessness believed; and again, I find it described as "a view for which there is scarcely the shadow of an apparent support in Scripture." What am I to think? What am I to say to this? Shall I abandon the course which I have followed for so many years, and which has led me, without any other teaching, to adopt so many of those glorious truths which I see advocated in your pages? Shall I say that the Father and God whom I have loved and trusted for so long has led me into a "serious error?" Or shall I say, in all humility, and with all tenderness and affection, that if you and others had fully understood what it has pleased God to show to some of those who have turned to him for light and truth, then the language used would not have been exactly what it is.

Ever sincerely yours,

F. M. C.

THE POWER OF TRUTH.

DEAR SIR,—I do not think that the mere fact of a pamphlet of mine having been made use of in this particular instance, should prevent me from sending you the enclosed letter, as an interesting illustration of the way in which truth is spreading all around us.

Digitized by Google

It will probably be as gratifying to your readers as to

Yours sincerely,
SAMUEL MINTON.
20, Warwick Square, S.W.

"I beg to apologise for writing to you, and trust you will excuse my doing so, being a complete stranger; but I have a long time had a great desire to inform you how thankful I am to have read your pamphlet, 'A New Bible,' &c. It is more than twenty years since the Lord in his mercy led me to seek after him, and from that time till now he has held me, and kept me from departing from him. As a child I was taught the doctrine of 'eternal torment,' and so much did I fear being led into error, that I think nothing but your pamphlet could have led me to search into the subject. About two years since I opened it, and read the first page; my attention became riveted; I was obliged to continue, and after that I had no choice. I felt that I must continually search the Scriptures, and pray that God our Father would show me the truth: and now for a long time it has been to me as clear as daylight. As passage after passage was made clear to me, I could but exclaim, 'How wonderful!' I am utterly astonished, now that my eyes have been opened to see the true Bible doctrine, that so many good Christians for so many years should have believed in the doctrine of 'eternal torment;' and can but offer up my prayers to the Almighty God, that the pure Bible truth may prevail over all error and falsehood."

Literature.

Ricordo Christiano dei Giorni Natalizii. Londra: Book Society, 28, Paternoster Row.

THE "Birthday Scripture Text Book" is, doubtless, well known to many of our lady readers. Of various editions of it in English something like a million copies have been sold. A French edition has also had a large circulation. Here we have the same thing in Italian, and as the compilation has in the present instance been made with much taste and care, and the little volume is neatly got up, we have no doubt it will be appreciated by our Italian sisters. The price is 2s.

NOTICES.

"PHILO-ISRAEL."—One of the best written and most convincing modern books on the subject of Anglo-Israel is that of Canon Titcomb. He proves, as far as such a matter is capable of proof, that we, the Anglo-Saxons, are Israelites. Apart from its intensely interesting object the book is charming reading. It is in the form of letters to "Anthony," and is entitled, "The Anglo-Israel Post-Bag; or, How Arthur came to see it." It is published by W. H. Guest, Paternoster Row. Price 2s. 6d.; by post 2d. extra.

"J. H." writes: "I am very glad to see, in this month's issue of the RAINBOW, the re-appearance of that jewel-article—such a solvent of the mystery!—"The Ministry of Evil." It will be a healing balm to thousands of bleeding hearts."

Digitized by Google

"H. G." writes, "Your prefatory paper in the last RAINBOW is excellent. Pity it is that those whom it most concerns may not see it."

"G. R. Y."—That any one professing belief in the Scriptures should deny, or even doubt, the "personality of the Devil," is to us inexplicable, except upon the principle that the "old liar" himself has suggested the idea. And nothing more likely! It is, no doubt, one of his "wiles." A stroke of policy of this kind is quite in keeping with the character of the great deceiver. The prince of darkness is an old hand at blinding the minds of men. Please to ask your friends who have come to the conclusion that there is no devil to account for the names by which he is known in the Bible, and the words and works which are there attributed to him. Can an "abstract principle" speak and act? But really, considering the tremendous history of the devil and his angels in our world, it seems a mere waste of time to say another word on the subject. See the articles Devil and Demons in any Biblical Dictionary; and see a paper by Mr. Maude, in the RAINBOW for July, 1872, entitled "The Prince of the Power of the Air." Above all, see the BIBLE on the subject!

"D. P."—All religion, all belief in revelation, all holy obedience, resolves itself into *loyalty to* GOD. Far be theory and speculation from us! We simply accept what God has said about man, man's world, and man's future. Apart from *His* teaching we know nothing about either. But perhaps you would rather listen to your hero, Carlyle, than to us. Here then is what he says: "The want of loyalty to the Maker of this universe—he who wants that, what else has he or can he have? If you do not, you man or nation, love the truth enough, but try to make a chapman-bargain with truth, instead of giving yourself wholly, soul and body and life to her, truth will not live with you, truth will depart from you, and only logic, 'wit'—for example, 'London wit'—sophistry, virtue, the æsthetic arts, and perhaps (for a short while) book-keeping by double entry, will abide with you. You will follow falsity and think it truth, you unfortunate man or nation! You will, right surely, you for one, stumble to the devil; and are every day, and hour, little as you imagine it, making progress thither." (Carlyle's *Frederick the Great.*)

"A FRIEND" says that he will believe in the return of the Jews to Palestine when he sees it. Well, there is not much risk in a faith of this kind, certainly! The old adage says, "Seeing is believing," which seems to be the small kind of faith of our "Friend." But what will he say if we tell him that the exodus from all lands has begun? A recent traveller says:—"Everywhere from Dan to Beersheba I saw evidence of the renewed energy and activity of the Jewish race. As a people, the Jews are flocking back to the land of their forefathers in great numbers from all countries in Europe. In Jerusalem and its neighbourhood particularly, every plot of ground for sale is eagerly bought up by them." Other travellers corroborate and amplify this statement. But we have long believed without seeing, because inspired prophets have told us of the events now at hand. The "set time" for Zion has nearly come, and we are on the eve of wonderful changes in the world. Let us thank God for fresh testimony to the truth of his word.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JULY, 1877.

CANON LIDDON ON IMMORTALITY.

THE long-forgotten record which God gave of his Son, that in him we have *eternal life*, is making itself heard in every part of Christendom. A plain indication of this may be seen in the fact, that the eloquent Canon of St. Paul's, who so lately "competed with Monseigneur Capel," as the *Times* well put it, "for the honour of leading people back into the dim and deserted caverns of the past," has devoted nearly a whole sermon in his own cathedral to a defence of the popular substitute for it, and that the *Guardian* has given a full report of his argument, with the names of some distinguished persons who were present on the occasion. The text was "Because I live ye shall live also." And the preacher laboured to prove, on *à priori* grounds of metaphysical speculation—which he entreated his hearers not to "scorn," but which St. Paul would most certainly have called "philosophy and vain deceit"—that it must not be understood to mean what it says, but must be amended to "Because I shall enjoy eternal blessedness, ye shall enjoy it also." He adduced nothing in favour of this perversion that has not again and again been shown to be utterly fallacious: but when fallacies are perseveringly repeated, they must be as perseveringly exposed. Many persons always go with the last speaker, whatever may have been said before; and the ablest defences of truth, or refutations of error, are apt to be soon forgotten. In this case, too, the very eminence of the preacher affords a sufficient reason for not letting his utterance pass. An intelligent lady, who is a great admirer of Canon Liddon, wrote to tell the present writer how strongly she had been confirmed in her faith by his entire failure to overthrow it; for as she justly remarked, "Liddon is a big man; and if he cannot argue better, who can?" It must then be worth while to see what such a controversial giant can make of the wrong side of this question. If even his monster gun shall prove innocuous, the citadel of truth must be impreg-

Digitized by Google

nable indeed. One or two *obitu dicta*, however, claim a little previous attention.

The phrase, "conditional immortality," is "new to Christian men." The same might once have been said of the word "Trinity:" but as a theological argument, little weight would be attached to such a remark by the orthodox divines of that day. We do not, however, profess to be perfectly satisfied with the phrase, although, for want of a better, we adopt it, not as an exhaustive definition, but as a sufficient indication of our belief in the general truth, that immortality is not the inalienable possession of every human germ which reaches a certain point of development, but must be sought for by patient continuance in well-doing. Does Canon Liddon mean to say that there is anything "new" about that,—except the fact of its having been recently forced upon the attention of the church with new energy? Passing over, for a moment, the teaching of Scripture, has he ever dipped into the writings of the early fathers, or given any attention to the demonstrations of Mr. White, Mr. Constable, or Mr. Denniston, that conditional immortality was the universal belief of the primitive church, and the prevalent belief of the first two or three centuries? To those who worship "the ages of faith," that is, the time of the church's deepest darkness, the doctrine that Christ gave his flesh for the *life* of the world, as well as for its restoration to holiness and happiness, and that only he who doeth the will of God can abide for ever, will no doubt appear a startling novelty, in spite of the plain declarations of Holy Writ. Having been drilled into the habit of putting a non-natural interpretation upon its language, they may pore over it all their lives, without a suspicion of its true meaning being ever once awakened. But if they would go back to the period between the Apostolic era and the time when the mystery of iniquity overshadowed the truth with such a dense cloud of error, they would be somewhat surprised to find—Clement of Rome saying, "How wonderful are the gifts of God. *Life in immortality*, splendour in righteousness, faith in assurance, self-control in holiness:" Ignatius—"For this end did the Lord suffer the ointment to be poured forth upon his head, that he might *breathe immortality into his church*;" "He that chooses evil shall be destroyed together with his works:" Hermas—"If you defile your flesh, you shall *not live*;" "Christ died for us, that believing in his death, we might *escape dying*;" "Watch as an athlete of God; the prize is *immortality* and *eternal life*;" "If he reward us according to our works, *we are no more*:" Barnabas—"Thou shalt not join thyself or be like to such men as are ungodly to the end, and *condemned to death*:" Justin Martyr—"God delays causing the confusion and destruction of the whole world, by which the wicked angels and demons and men shall *cease to exist*;" "The soul partakes of life, since God wishes it to live. So then it will not partake of it at such a time a God does not

Digitized by Google

choose that it shall live. For as the body does not keep company for ever with the soul, but when it becomes needful that the harmony should be dissolved, the soul leaves the body, and the man is not; so also when it is needful that the soul should no longer be, the vital spirit departs from it, *and the soul exists no longer*, but it also returns to the place whence it was taken;" "We have been taught that those only *attain to immortality*, who live holily and virtuously near to God:" Irenæus—"He who shall preserve the life bestowed upon him, and give thanks to him who imparted it, shall also receive length of days for ever and ever. But he who shall reject it, and prove himself ungrateful to his Maker, deprives himself of continuance for ever and ever;" "It is written, They shall perish, but thou art the same, the children of thy servants shall continue; thus pointing out plainly what things they are that are to pass away, and who it is that doth endure for ever,—God together with his servants:" Theophilus—"To the unbelieving there shall be anger and wrath, tribulation and woe; as the end to which sorrows, eternal fire shall prevail over them:" Clemens Alexandrinus—"Just as, if the sun had not been in existence, night would have brooded over the universe, so, had we not known the Word, and been illuminated by him, we should have been in no wise different from fowls that are being fed, fattened in darkness, and *nourished for death*."

As darkness set in, this truth was lost sight of, and for long ages far different ideas prevailed. But so sooner does the returning light appear in the sixteenth century than we find Luther boldly saying, "I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful; such as, that the soul is the substantial form of the human body,—*that the soul is immortal*,—with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman decretals." It is evident that, with all his researches into Holy Scripture, he had not "found" the immortality of the soul taught *there*. Neither had Milton when he made sin thus address Satan:—

> "Before mine eyes in opposition sits
> Grim death, my son and foe, who sets them on,
> And me, his parent, would full soon devour,
> For want of other prey, but that he knows
> His end with mine involved; and knows that I
> Should prove a bitter morsel and his bane,
> Whenever that shall be: so fate pronounced.
> But thou, O Father! I forewarn thee, shun
> His deadly arrow; neither vainly hope
> To be invulnerable in those bright arms,
> Though tempered heavenly; for that mortal dint,
> Save he who reigns above, none can resist."

The vigorous intellect of Locke also clearly perceived the non-natural interpretations of Scripture that it necessarily involved. "By death," he says, "some men understand endless torments in hell-fire. But it seems a strange way of understanding a law

Digitized by Google

which requires the plainest and directest words, that by death should be meant eternal life in misery. Can any one be supposed to intend by a law which says, 'For felony thou shalt surely *die*,' not that he should lose his life, but be kept alive in exquisite and perpetual torments? And would any one think himself fairly dealt with that was so used?"

It is within our own days, however, that the truth of immortality through Christ's redemption has been brought out in such a way as to command very wide-spread assent and well-nigh universal attention. Any one who knows what is passing around him will scarcely be able to avoid a smile on reading the Canon's reference to it in the words, "Of which we have heard something of late." Unless the walls of St. Paul's cathedral are enormously thick, he must surely have heard a good deal about it. Is he aware that Archbishop Whately maintained the natural meaning of life and death in one of his sermons on "the Future Life?" That Archbishop Thompson says in his *Bampton Lectures*, "Life to the godless must be the beginning of destruction, since nothing but God, and that which pleases him, can permanently exist?" That Archbishop Trench writes, in his *Synonymes of the New Testament*: "In the creature, that only lives or triumphs over death, death at once physical and spiritual, which has first triumphed over sin?" That Dean Alford's comment on Gen. iii. 22 is, "Our narrative implies, as St. Paul asserts (1 Cor. xv. 47), that man was created subject to death, but would by the use of the Tree of Life have gained immortality;" and that he holds Adam's exclusion from that tree of life to have been "the carrying out of the sentence, In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die?" Did he ever hear the words of the late Dr. Mortimer, head master of the City of London School: "I hesitate not to bear my testimony to the correctness of your statements as to two matters of much importance—first that ἀπόλλυμι, whenever and wherever it occurs in a Greek author, has but one meaning, the destruction of the object to which it is the active verb; secondly, that an immortality inherent in man is an unscriptural figment?" Does he know that the *Contemporary Review* in a hostile article admitted, "If we are bound by the letter of Scripture, we cannot refuse this belief?" That the belief in question is publicly taught by one of the first Nonconformist ministers in England, Mr. Dale of Birmingham? That it was preached and published almost at his elbow in the old Poultry Chapel by Dr. Parker? That it is openly advocated by other able ministers, too numerous to mention, in every section of the Christian church, and in every part of the world; as well as by numbers of intelligent laymen, occupying the very first position in their respective spheres? Has he ever heard of Professor Stokes of Cambridge, or Professor Barret of Dublin; and does he know that they are with us? Has he only "heard something" of one of the greatest theological

Digitized by Google

works of the present day, Mr. White's "Life in Christ;" and has he observed how it is spoken of by Professors Tait of Edinburgh, and Balfour Stewart of Manchester, in "The Unseen Universe?" Is he aware of the extent to which the doctrine is making its way amongst leading men at Oxford and Cambridge; of the endless clerical meetings, episcopal and non-episcopal, at which it forms the subject of discussion? Did he ever hear that one of the foremost men in the Irish Synod, a Professor of Trinity College, Dublin, avowed his inability to understand "how any man, with two ideas in his head, and the Bible in his hand can doubt it?" Does he know that the perhaps two or three hundred thousand persons who see the *Christian World* every week are never allowed very long to forget the battle that is raging over it; and that even the religious papers that would be only too glad to suppress the subject altogether cannot help sometimes giving a start, or uttering a shriek, when a fresh explosion occurs? Has he ever tried to guess how many English Bishops and Deans probably hold his view of "everlasting weal or woe;" or how many of those who persuade themselves that they do, ever give utterance to it in public from one year's end to the other? Is he aware of the light and joy, the relief and strength that this truth is bringing to our fellow labourers in the church's mission fields, especially in India? He may perhaps be pardoned for not having seen the remarkable letters of Mr. Hobbes in our own columns; but surely he has heard more than "something" of that wonderful mission to the Santhals conducted by Bærensen the Dane and Skrefsrud the Norwegian; and if so, he will be interested to learn that the latter, one of the first linguists in the world, a man who can speak twenty languages fluently, and has some knowledge of many more, has expressed his opinion, that "if any dependence is to be placed on the laws of language" there can be no second opinion on the subject. But why proceed further? Surely we have at least said enough to show that the time has gone by when this question could be dismissed with a supercilious wave of the hand.

Still, though we are glad to learn that the standard we have been called upon to raise is neither a "new" one, nor unsupported by the wise and good, yet it is on no human arm that we rely. As Mr. Spurgeon well says, "It becomes all of us to examine whether those religious dogmas which we have accepted on account of their apparent venerableness of age and universality of custom, are indeed the truth. Is the thing right? Then follow it, though thou hast discovered it but yesterday." And how are we to know whether it be right? Can there be any other than one answer to this question? "To the law, and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." On this, at least, the Canon of St. Paul's and ourselves will be at one. But there, unhappily, the agreement ends. "Such persons" as hold the doctrine of immortality in Christ, he calmly tells his

Digitized by Google

hearers, "apparently forget the doctrine of the New Testament, that man will live eternally on in weal or in woe." He must really forgive us if we cannot suppress another smile. A Christian should be thankful for anything which helps him to cultivate the grace of humility. And it may tend to preserve us from being exalted above measure, to find thus unmistakably that one of the most prominent ecclesiastics of the English Church has never read one single page of the innumerable books, pamphlets, and tracts which we have been pouring forth from the press for years past.

Another proof of this is afforded by the following account of our supposed belief: "Man in a state of nature becomes extinct, if not actually at his death, at least shortly after, when anything which had survived his death will fade into nothingness." Does he think that the day of judgment will come "shortly after" the death of Cain? or that the "everlasting destruction" which will go forth against the wicked "from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power" at Christ's appearing, "when he shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God," will be merely *a fading into nothingness* of "what has survived his death?" If the Canon had even honoured our writings with a passing glance, he would have known our faith to be, that "the second death," which is the full "wages of sin," the ultimate result of the original sentence, "Thou shalt surely die," is the everlasting, that is final and irremediable, destruction, not of that alone which "survives" the first death, but of "both soul and body," when "they that have done evil come forth unto the resurrection of damnation." Such astounding lack of information as to what he supposes himself to be controverting, manifested by so prominent a divine, gives great encouragement to hope that, when those who are now most strongly opposed to the truth can be got to look into the matter, a very marked change will come over their views.

The "something" he has "heard" in the depth of his cloister evidently, is, that we have been denying man's necessary immortality on some speculative grounds of our own, *forgetting* that it is distinctly taught in the New Testament. A newspaper critic remarked that Dr. Liddon evidently forgot that this was the whole question at issue. We are reminded of an American professor who, on asking a student under examination, if he could tell what caused the Aurora Borealis, and being told after a little thought that "he had forgotten that," turned to the class and said, "Well, gentlemen, was there ever such a piece of bad luck in the world? Here is the only man who ever knew what produced the Aurora Borealis,—and he has forgotten it." It is simply impossible that this learned divine can have forgotten what was the question at issue, if he had ever known it. He is manifestly in blissful ignorance that there is any question whatever as to the teaching of Scripture on this subject. And, however surprising this may be in him, it is precisely the state of

Digitized by Google

mind of vast numbers of otherwise intelligent and well-informed Christians in this enlightened country and in this enlightened century. They have been born and bred to believe that no one but an infidel doubts the immortality of the soul, and as they have no wish to trouble themselves with what infidels may say or think, there is an end of the matter. It is quite clear that we shall have to go on laying the foundations again and again, and showing what are the first principles of the doctrine of Christ on this subject.

What, then, saith the Scripture? "The doctrine of the New Testament," Dr. Liddon tells his hearers, is "that man will live eternally on in weal or in woe;" and he also asserts that "Christ treated the immortality of the soul as a certainty." What are his proofs? Will our readers believe us when we inform them that the only passage of Scripture, from Genesis to Revelation, which he ventures to adduce is, "Be not weary in well doing." As this could not be addressed to an animal or a plant, man must be immortal. This is his reply to the challenge which has been sounded like a trumpet, some think too loudly and persistently, to produce a single word or sentence from the Bible, that asserts or implies man's necessary immortality. Mr. Baldwin Brown admitted, at the opening of his first course of lectures, that we should "hear very little of texts." The Canon makes no such avowal; but in his practical shrinking from an appeal to Scripture, he beats our conditional-universalist friend hollow.

Almost more remarkable than this failure of any serious attempt to make good his own assertions as to the teaching of Scripture, is the mode in which he treats his text—"Because I live ye shall live also." He begins by showing how distinctly it implies the doctrine of immortality through Himself alone. "This saying of our Lord's could only be understood in the light of the ascension and resurrection. When he said, 'Because I live ye shall live also,' he had his death immediately before him, he was taking the measure of death. To him death, with all its misery, was to be no interruption of his ever-continuing life, and in no sense was it to be its close, for already he sees his resurrection before him, and he exclaims, 'I live.' It was not possible, as St. Peter said, that 'he should be holden of it,' and so he treats death as already vanquished, as an enemy which could have no permanent effect on his indestructible life. And this life of his is the cause of our life, 'Because I live ye shall live also.' He describes what he knows to be before him when he said, 'Yet a little while and the world seeth me no more.' He would be hidden away in the grave from the eyes of men; yet he adds, 'Ye see me; because I live ye shall live also.' His disciples would see him first, with their bodily eyes after his resurrection, and then with the eye of faith through all the ages. In the words, 'Because I live ye shall live also,' he asserted that because of the continuity of his life the disciples might be assured of the continuity of their own. Because he lives after his ascension

Digitized by Google

in the life of glory, therefore his disciples shall live also." Excellent! Our best contributors could not have put it more clearly. To "live" does not mean to be holy and happy, but to have "the continuity of life" preserved unbroken,—to possess an "indestructible" life. And this is guaranteed to his disciples by virtue of their union with him. No one in his senses could imagine that our Lord was speaking of something that belonged naturally to every human germ which reaches a certain stage of development. The direct inference from the preacher's own explanation of the words is that those who are not Christ's disciples do not possess an "indestructible life," and that its "continuity" will *not* be preserved for ever. At this point of his discourse, every intelligent hearer before him must have thought that he was about to announce his conversion to the old Scriptural and primitive doctrine, that the wages of sin is death, and the gift of God in Christ is eternal life. Imagine their utter bewilderment, when he at once proceeded to say, "In considering these words of Christ, let us first observe what they do not mean. They do not mean that the immortality of the soul of man is dependent on the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, or on his glorified life." Why, he had just been "considering" them, and shown that they do mean that,—and something more; namely, that the immortality of the whole man depends upon Christ, "Ye"—not your souls only, or any part of you, but ye—"shall live also." The preacher remarks, "He does not say, if I exist ye shall exist also." No; for a marble statue might *exist* for ever, if God so pleased: but he does say "live;" and Dr. L. has just shown very clearly that living, in this passage, means *existing alive*,—the very thing which, it is the object of his sermon to show, constitutes no special privilege of Christ's disciples. The privilege really intended, he argues in the teeth of his own admirable exegesis, is "something beyond mere existence, not only beyond the animal existence, but beyond mere spiritual existence;" namely, "the existence of a being who makes the most of his endowments, whose conscience directs him to the object in whom his being is raised and transfigured by the operations of grace." In plain prose, to live does *not* mean to possess an "indestructible" life, or to preserve its "continuity," but to be holy and happy. This is just the stereotyped perversion of language to which those are necessarily driven who will persist in rejecting the plain record that God has given of his Son, and which, as one error always leads to another, has to be supplemented by a corresponding perversion—pronounced by Dr. Weymouth, of Mill Hill, to be as violent a one as his mind can conceive—"when the five or six strongest words which the Greek tongue possesses to signify destroy and destruction, are interpreted to mean—being sustained in an everlasting but wretched existence."

To justify this perversion, we are reminded that "the Greeks had a particular word to describe the higher life of man, and this

Digitized by Google

word our Lord must have used, or, at least, the word which was equivalent to it in the eastern dialect in which he spoke." That word *Zoe* was certainly not used *exclusively* of man's higher life, or of man's life at all; for it was applied to that of animals, as the term zoology shows. But our opponent "apparently forgets" that the Greeks had another word for life, *psuche*, which never means the higher life, but physical life only, and that Christ threatens his disciples with the loss of *that*, if they fail in their allegiance to him. "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Dr. L. will scarcely interpret this to mean, "He that findeth the higher life shall lose it; and he that loseth the higher life for my sake shall find it." Nothing can be plainer than our Lord's meaning. Whosoever saves his life by unfaithfulness now shall lose his life hereafter by "the second death;" whereas whosoever is willing to sacrifice his life for Christ's sake now shall save his life hereafter, or, in Old Testament language, "shall save his soul alive." The only difference is, that in this world it can be saved or lost for a time, in the next it will be saved or lost for ever. Does this look as if "Christ treated the immortality of man as a certainty?" If he is "immortal," if he possesses an "indestructible life," the "continuity" of which can never be broken, how can he ever "lose it," or, as our Lord elsewhere says, "lose *himself?*"

But the extraordinary nature of the Canon's assertion is rendered still more apparent by our Lord's words in Matt. x. 28, "Fear not them which *kill the body*, but are not able to *kill the soul;* but rather fear him which is able to *destroy both soul and body* in hell." The Platonic philosophy maintained that man's soul was "immortal," and could *never* be "killed," or "destroyed," at all; Plato, and his followers, using the very word *apollumi* (destroy) to indicate that which *could not* happen to it. The Pharisees accepted that philosophy; as does Canon Liddon. Our Lord admitted, that it was beyond the power of man to destroy a human soul, but asserted that it was *not* beyond the power of God; and warned them that he *would* utterly destroy, body and soul, all those who did not "fear him," burning them up like chaff with "unquenchable fire," and inflicting upon them, ultimately, the "everlasting punishment" of "everlasting destruction." Many earnest Christians hold this to be a most "dangerous" doctrine, directly calculated to make men *not* "fear" God,—destruction being the very boon for which "the natural man" craves. Nothing, they contend, will inspire sinners with "fear," except the belief that God will never destroy either body or soul at all, but preserve them both alive in "an everlasting but wretched existence." Who is the truest philosopher—Christ or Plato and Canon Liddon? Who knows best what is most calculated to make men fear God—Christ, or modern preachers? Which shall we believe—the Word of God, or the traditions of men?

Digitized by Google

It would be quite beyond our compass to do anything like justice to this branch of the subject. We can only beg the Canon to read some of our books. Or if he has not time for that, will he do us the favour carefully to examine the four pages (238-241) on John vi. in Mr. White's "Life in Christ," and then tell us whether he thinks the manna was given to Israel to make them holy and happy, or to preserve for a time the "continuity" of their life? And if the latter, how it is possible to mistake the contrast drawn by Christ between the temporary effect of that manna which did not keep the Israelites permanently alive, and the eternal effect of eating his flesh by faith, namely, that those who do so shall "*not* die?"

On another occasion we shall consider what intrinsic value attaches to those *à priori* metaphysical presumptions of human immortality which man's ingenuity has developed out of his own inner consciousness, and which this great divine "apparently" considers to be the true key for the interpretation of Scripture on the doctrine of life and death; or, as we should put it, a lever strong enough to upturn its entire testimony, and "make" the author of that testimony a "liar."

SAMUEL MINTON.

CHRIST PRECIOUS TO THE BELIEVER.

"Unto you which believe he is precious."—1 PETER v. 7.

O LORD, the spring of grace divine,
For grace we offer praise;
If other gift we cannot give,
Our hearts to thee we raise.

The beauties of thy wondrous life,
So lowly yet so grand,
And full of sweetest sympathy,
Admiring thoughts command.

The sun that shines on mortal men,
With pure immortal light,
Is gently veiled in Christ the man,
That men may bear the sight.

We gaze enraptured, and adore
The Father and the Son:
The story of redeeming love
Declares what they have done.

Beyond all words, all thought beyond,
The Saviour's worth ascends;
And this will fill our minds and hearts
In life that never ends.

Digitized by Google

"SPIRITS IN PRISON."

"Christ . . . being put to death in flesh, but being made alive in spirit, by which, and by (or with) the spirits that watch (or the spirits on guard), he went and preached to those who formerly were unbelieving (disobedient) when the patience of God was waiting in the days of Noah while an ark was being prepared."—1 PET. iii. 18-20. (*Free Translation.*)

WE have here one of the disputed passages of the sacred volume. An awkward and I think unwarranted rendering of it has furnished the ground of many errors, making the text the theme of much discussion. Romanists, Restorationists, and all sorts of errorists have made use of it to prop up their false doctrines, while the honest orthodox have been left to stumble over its meaning. It has been quoted to support a purgatory, to prove probation after death, to substantiate a belief in the heathen *hades*, and to exhibit the immortality of the human soul, and its continued existence in an underworld. Dr. Whitby refers it to the Gentiles, alive in body, but dead in sin; while Bishop Pearson, for the English church, argues from it the preaching of Christ while dead to the dead saints in *hades*, to comfort them in their long detention. Some make the "prison" to be *hades*—the aggregate of all graves—the dead therein being unconscious; while others, putting it along with that clause of the Apostles' Creed, "he descended into hell," teach that Christ while dead went to the vulgar hell or place of torment, and preached the Gospel to the lost. But "both claiming truth and truth disclaiming both" may be applied to *all* of these views.

I have something better, something truer. My views are no novelty, nor are they an innovation. With me they are at least eighteen years old. Thus long have I been quite certain that Peter never penned the idea here popularly attributed to him. Having lately given the "enigmatical" passage (as a writer calls it) a thorough study and critical investigation, I see no reason to change my cherished opinion respecting its meaning. Bold innovation is censurable, but to burn off the warts of a healthy body is well. It leaves the body to stand out clear in its beauty and symmetry. One truth is worth more than a million of errors. I believe that wrong translations are sources of error, that tend to divide true Christians. The Bible is one grand harmony. He that contributes a ray of light to its true exegesis is the friend of its great Author, and no enemy to the vexed and tossed church of Jesus.

You will observe that for the word "prison" in King James's version, I have substituted "watch" or "guard" as a better rendering of the Greek word φυλακῇ—*phulakee*. This is the main word in dispute. What is its sense in the text? Now the common English reader will be a little surprised to know that in all the Greek lexicons it is defined as follows, namely:—

(1.) A watching or guarding, keeping watch or guard, especially by night; keep watch and ward; to be on the watch on account of

Digitized by Google

any one. (2.) A watch or guard of a person, like the Latin *custodia* for *custos;* a body guard, a guard or garrison of a place or fortress. (3.) Of place: a watch station, post; the watches. (4.) Of time: a watch, e.g., of the night. (5.) A place for keeping others in a ward, a prison. (See Liddell and Scott, Robinson, &c. &c.)

Now here we see it refers *first* to the act of watching or guarding; *second*, to the being who watches; *third*, to the place where the watching is done; *fourth*, a period of the night; and *fifth*, the place where the thing or person watched is held in custody. Why have the translators chosen the last instead of the first sense of this word? Why reject watching, the primary sense, for prison, evidently the secondary sense of *phulakee?*

Example: "He [Xenophon] ordered them [the soldiers, *phulakas*] to keep the [*phulassein*] nightly watch." (See in Plutarch.) In the New Testament *phulakee* is variously rendered watch, ward, hold, cage, and prison. The word is from φυλαξ—*phulax*, "a keeper," and its perfect act is φυλασσω—*phulasso*, "to keep." In all the New Testament the terms "keep" and "kept" are the general English words for *phulasso*. In Luke iv. 10, *diaphulassai* occurs, and in no other place, and is here rendered to keep (guard or protect—Diaglott), and in this case the keepers or guards were the angels.

In Luke ii. 8, the Greek is *phulasontes phulakas*, i.e., "keeping the watches" of the night. In Matt. xiv. 25, Matt. xxiv. 43, Mark vi. 48, and in Luke xii. 38, *phulakee* is rendered "watch," while in every place where the word is rendered "prison," it is implied that a watch or guard was set over the prison, the idea of the place being inseparable from its keepers or guardians. Thus in Acts xii. 4, 5, we learn that when Peter was put in *phulakeen*, "a prison," there were four quarternions of soldiers set (*phulassein*) "to guard him." And so it is said the apostle was "watched by the (*phulakee*) guard." (See Diaglott.) Here then is sufficient proof to show that *phulakee* may mean in my text a watch or guard. And instead of doing violence to the text, have I not wrested it from a lawless gang of errors?

"Spirits that watch"—who are they? There is but one answer, viz., the holy angels. How strange that this word *pneumati* has so long been forced to mean the spirits of the dead! I marvel at it. In forty-six instances the word in the New Testament refers to demons or evil angels, of whom Satan, "the lost archangel," is chief, he being the powerful (*pneumatos*) "spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." (Eph. ii. 2.) And of the good angels thus it is written: "From the seven *spirits* which are before the throne." (Rev. i. 4.) "Who maketh his angels *spirits?*" (Heb. i. 7.) "Are they not all ministering *spirits?*" (Verse 8.)

It is the province of the eye to see, to scan, to watch. These burning lamps, fiery ones, or angel-spirits are "the eyes of the

Digitized by Google

Lord that run to and fro through all the earth." (Zech. iv. 10.) And while they exercise their watch-care over the church, their speed is "as a flash of lightning." (Ezek. i. 14.) We know it is the task of the angels to watch over in sacred guardianship the elect of the Lord. Thus:

"He shall send his *angel* before thee." (Gen. xxiv. 7, 40.) "*Angel* of God who went before Israel." (Exod. xiv. 19.) "Sent an *angel* and brought us out of Egypt." (Num. xx. 16.) "Michael your [Israel's] prince" (or chief). (Dan. x. 21.) "Michael the great prince [chief or archangel] who standeth for the children of thy people." (Dan. xii. 1.) "Michael and his *angels* fought." (Rev. xii. 7.) "They said, It is his [Peter's] angel." (Acts xii. 15.) "Their [children's] *angels* always behold the face of God." (Matt. xviii. 10.) "The *angel* of the Lord encampeth [pitched his tent] around about them," &c. (Psa. xxxiv. 7.)

These Scriptures abundantly prove that holy angels are spirits, and that they guard the affairs of Christ's people. Hence they are styled "the watchers." (Heb., *geer*.) We find them so called in Dan. iv. 13, 17, 23. Prof. Aaron Pick defines the Hebrew word as "a watcher," (plural) "watchers;" and Dr. Gesenius makes it denote "a watcher, a name for angel in the later Hebrew, as keeping watch over the affairs of men." (See Lex.) In the liturgies of Syria the word is used to name the archangels, as of Gabriel and others, while in the "Book of Enoch," the angels both good and bad are styled "watchers." The good angels are "watchers of heaven." Of Enoch the writer of this book says: "He was wholly engaged with the holy ones and with the watchers in his days." (Chap. xii. 2.) This agrees with Daniel who saw the holy watchers descend from heaven. Wintle, who is a fine translator and a good expositor of Daniel, calls this "watcher" (even a holy one descending from heaven—his version) an angel, a divine legate, a select one, denoting that he was one of a very high order. The decree of the watcher is in verse 24 styled the decree of the Most High, as if it were some vast conclusion arrived at in the grand celestial councils of Deity with his angels. (1 Kings xx. 19.) Lowth, Auberlen, Clarke, and all the expositors accord with this view of the watchers.

Hence the meaning of Peter becomes plainer and plainer. He is informing his readers how our Lord was put to death, how he was again made alive; the re-living being accomplished by the agency of the Holy Spirit. He then adds that this divine Spirit, assisted by and in company with angel-spirits (as he ever is) who are the guardians of men, aided in the ministry of Noah before the flood. There is not here the faintest allusion to the imprisonment of any human spirits in *hades*.

Our view is strengthened by a reference to the Hebrew word in the Old Testament that corresponds with *phulakee*, viz., *shah-mar*. The genius of the term is seen in Num. i. 51-53 and iii. 7. The Levites

Digitized by Google

were charged with the safe keeping of the tabernacle. They were to "encamp around about it," and minister to it, just as the angels do with the saints. They were "*to keep* the charge of the tabernacle of testimony." They were the chosen keepers, guards, watchmen, of the entire sanctuary. So too in Gen. ii. 24, cherubim were stationed "*to keep* the way of the tree of life." And again of Christ and his people it is declared, "he (God) shall give his angels charge over thee *to keep thee* in all thy ways." (Psa. xci. 11.)

Πορευθεις—*porcutheis*, rendered in thevulgar version, "he went," in the word for word rendering in the Diaglott, "having gone," or as other scholars render it, "going," and which with the word that follows forms the sentence, "went and preached," is used as a pleonasm, and is often prefixed as a participle to verbs which, says Dr. Robinson, "of themselves imply the idea of going, in order to render the expression more full and complete." (Lex.) The word is omitted as superfluous in Wilson's Diaglott.

The Greek απειθεω—*apeitheo*, in verse 20, conveys the idea of a practical unbelief ending in wilful disobedience. Some versions have it "disobedient" while in others it is "unbelieving."

It may be claimed that Peter's language compels us to believe that Christ went and preached personally to the antediluvians. Not so. In Eph. ii. 17 we have again this pleonasm, thus: "And [Christ] came and preached peace to you who were afar off," &c. This preaching, we infer from the context, was after his cross and resurrection, and those afar off were the Gentiles. But it is certain that our Lord did not after the cross go personally to the Gentiles to preach peace to them. He preached to them by proxy, that is by his apostles. Thus if Christ is said, by Paul, to go and do what he did by his apostles, he may with perfect propriety be said, by Peter, to go and do what he did (1) by Noah, (2) by the Holy Spirit, and (3) by the holy watchers.

If it be said there is implied in our view a preaching by angels, the answer is, the Scriptures assert the "ministry of angels," and that warnings of evil or good to come made by angels were of frequent occurrence in Old Testament times, as seen in the case of Lot, Abraham, &c., while in the later times the natal song of Christ was sung by angels, and the first proclamation of the second coming made this side of the cross came from the lips of the "holy watchers." (Acts i. 10, 11.) Hence this objection vanishes.

Once more: "Preached," from κηρυσσω—*keerusso*, to publish, is used sixty times in the original. It means the open, public, aboveboard proclamation of the Gospel to living men on earth, and never in a single instance an invisible, clandestine proclamation of the good news to dead men in *hades*, below the earth's surface. "In the New Testament," says the Lexicographer Robinson, "the word means to proclaim, to announce publicly, to publish," It means, says Prof. Parkhurst, "to publish, declare publicly, make publicly known." It means, say Liddell and Scott, "that which is cried by

Digitized by Google

a herald or crier, a proclamation, public notice." Even so. How then can this passage be forced to mean a surreptitious, secretly conveyed, mysteriously promulgated message to the dead in an unknown and unseen world? The idea is absurd. All the more so when it is seen that there is not a word in the passage concerning what our Lord did while he was dead! Moreover, to suppose the Gospel to be preached to men after this life is utterly mischievous and pernicious. It is inconsistent with the nature, scope, and end of the Gospel, which is preached with such commands, ordinances, and fruits connected therewith as concerns only men in this life. Those who are dead are not proper objects for the Gospel to be preached to. Their fate is fixed. The view is forced and improbable. The means, the end, the proper effect of such preaching are all wanting. Consequently the notion can only be totally rejected by all orthodox Protestants.

It is inconsistent with the whole Bible also to suppose that our Lord while dead went and preached to the antediluvians only, as a class. Why to them only and no others? Surely Peter includes no others but those before the flood. No answer to this objection has ever been vouchsafed by those who from age to age have blindly followed each other in assenting to the vulgar interpretation of this supposed mysterious passage.

Now we are simply told that the divine Spirit of God and Christ, and high celestial spirits accompanying, were agencies in preaching God's word to the hosts before the flood in Noah's time. The Spirit employed the instrumentality of Noah who is called "a preacher of righteousness." (2 Pet. ii. 6.) Noah, St. Paul asserts, "was warned of God." (Heb. xi. 7.) That when he preached to men the Holy Spirit assisted, is plainly taught in Gen. vi. 3, "My Spirit shall not always strive with men." If it be asked, where does Moses say in Genesis that angel spirits operated with the Gospel by Noah, to assist the strivings of the Spirit with evil men? I reply by asking, where does Moses say God revealed to Abraham the existence, as a thing of promise and hope, of the Holy City, New Jerusalem? The fact is, the Mosaic record is not full. Many things are omitted. Paul declared Abraham looked for that city, (Heb. xi. 10), and Peter says angels were with Noah. I can easily believe both. It is in the nature of the case as well as in harmony with subsequent angelic action to suppose that the spirits that watch did aid Noah in all his work of one hundred and twenty years' ark-building and ministry. In all this long period God, angels, and Noah strove with an evil race. Warnings of their guilt and danger filled the air. Blindness, unbelief, lawlessness, rendered all mercies ineffectual. The bolts of wrath fell. They perished. So shall it be in the days of the coming of the Son of Man.

Finally, I have been very particular, very exhaustive in my criticisms, because while challenging the reply of the erudite by the audacity of my work, more especially am I writing for the common

Digitized by Google

English reader, who has no ponderous tomes of Hebrew and Greek piled about him to assist him in interpreting the original. I desire to make this matter very plain to all candid minds. May I not hope that I have done so? And if a single ray of light is hereby contributed towards a better understanding of God's good volume, then my aim is accomplished.

Bible Banner. D. T. TAYLOR.

ON SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR LORD'S TEACHING.

NOTHING is more remarkable in our Lord's ministry than the generally *veiled* character of his teaching. We should have expected, *à priori*, that the long-looked for, long-desired Messiah, who, "when he came, was to teach us all things," would have spoken in terms which it was impossible to misunderstand. The very reverse, however, is so frequently the case as almost to make it appear that it was not his general rule to speak plainly. The Evangelists put the matter beyond dispute, telling us clearly that, usually at least, "without a parable" he spake not to the multitude. But even more than this,—and what seems more wonderful still,—he did not speak with perfect plainness even to his disciples themselves. They frequently misinterpreted his words and his commands, and often seemed unable to comprehend what he meant. It is true that he expounded many things to them which he did not to the multitude, but still he often left them to misunderstand if they would,—he never *forces* any truth upon them.

I purpose in this paper to give some proofs of the above statement, and then to show that this was done for purposes consistent with the highest reason and goodness, and that Christ "did not without cause all that he did in the midst of them."

With regard to the fact of his usually parabolic style of teaching, this is so plain as to need no argument; but many instances may be adduced from the Evangelists wherein he spake that which though spiritually and in the noblest sense true, was not so *literally;* proving to us that we must not always take the letter of Scripture as conveying to us the commands of God. Such expressions as, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," where it is clear that the multitude thought he spake of the literal temple. "The damsel is not dead but sleepeth," when she was literally *dead.* "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, that defileth a man." "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood," &c. These, and other sayings of a like character, prove that he frequently spake in such a manner that he was misunderstood by the unspiritual. Then, again, as to the disciples; when he said:

Digitized by Google

"Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees," they thought he spake it because they had taken no bread, and our Lord was obliged to rebuke them for their "hardness of heart." So when he said, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth," they thought he spake of literal sleep, and he was obliged to tell them that Lazarus was dead; and this, be it observed, when these disciples ought to have known better, since they had been present when he said of Jairus' daughter, "The damsel is not dead but sleepeth." Another instance is afforded by the passage in which he speaks of his being "delivered into the hands of men," and the disciples seem to have been unable to comprehend what he meant. Again, when he said: "I have meat to eat that ye know not of," the disciples thought he spake of literal food, and it was very natural that they should do so under the circumstances, for they had actually gone into the town to purchase food, and when the food was brought to him he merely said, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." This was certainly a case where even the spiritually minded might most naturally make a mistake. Another instance is offered by our Lord's words to the disciples: "Whither I go ye know, and the way ye know;" when, from the reply of Thomas, it is clear that none of them understood his meaning. Other instances of a similar character might be no doubt adduced. But beyond all else in the way of proof, what can be more conclusive than our Lord's own words, shortly before his crucifixion: "The time cometh when I will no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you *plainly* of the Father." Here it is evident that not only did he *not* usually speak plainly of the Father even to his disciples, but they themselves seem to have been somewhat startled at his clearness of expression now, for their remark, "Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb" (John xvi. 29), appears to have been spoken in their astonishment. On the whole I think it is quite clear that very frequently our Lord spoke both to the disciples and to the multitude in such a way that they took *literally* what he meant *spiritually*.

Having thus given what appears to me sufficient proof that our Lord did as a rule speak in metaphor, in parable, and in "dark sayings;" I shall endeavour to show that this was all done in righteousness and truth.

It should be noticed, first of all, that there was one grand exception to this general rule, viz., *the Sermon on the Mount;* for although there are some metaphorical statements even in it,—such as, "Whosoever shall smite thee on the one cheek turn to him the other also,"—yet on the whole the teaching was here plain and distinct; and moreover, though spoken primarily to the Apostles, it was manifestly intended to be heard by all the people. I think we may gather from the Evangelists that it was as opposition increased that his discourses became more and more veiled. Our Lord is in this respect like the fabled sibyl of old, if rejected at first less is

Digitized by Google

afterwards given. When requested by the Gadarenes to depart out of their coasts, Christ at once departed, and, so far as we know, never returned; though he left with them, in mercy, the man who had been a demoniac, and told him to proclaim openly what God had done for him.

Now all this is in accordance with God's dealing with ourselves; truth is offered plainly at certain times, but if rejected and disbelieved, it becomes more or less veiled in shadows and darkness. The case is very similar to that of the *habitual* commission of *sin*. At first the conscience is very tender and very sensitive, but if tried too much and too often, it soon loses its sensitive character and all feeling seems gone, so that at last nothing less than the direct interference of the Almighty can restore and recreate it. The spirit of God will not always strive with man, and therefore even revelation itself becomes darkness to those who "will have none of God's reproofs." "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they shall believe a lie."

Hence revelation, as Mr. Jukes remarks very truly, is quite as much a *veiling* as an *unveiling* and *revealing*. "The letter of Scripture is a veil quite as much as a revelation, hiding while it reveals, and yet revealing while it hides." "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing, but the honour of kings (i.e., the elect) to search out a matter."

Nature, like her author, is frequently misinterpreted and our very senses until properly educated are apt sometimes, even in natural things, to deceive us. "Is it not a fact that our sense-readings, even of the clearest physical phenomena are opposed to the truth, and need to be corrected by a higher faculty? Is it not further a fact that nature hides almost more than it reveals of God our Saviour?"*

Not that either nature or any of our faculties properly used are in any respect faulty; but that often the *first* impressions made on our senses are misleading. Just as in looking at the sun darkness results from too much light, or as too great a sound or perfume injures the respective senses of hearing or smell; so is it with too clear a revelation to those unprepared for it. It is unquestionably true that the eye can only see what it has been taught to see, just as all our senses and all our faculties require to be *educated* before they quite fulfil their purposes. It is to those who "by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil," that Christ manifests himself. Jesus Christ is still to the world what he was during the days of his flesh. Like Pilate the world again and again asks him to speak but he answers not. The world, as Dr. Parker remarks, has always seemed half to approach and half to fly from Christ; and our Lord has even to men of the world a strange mysterious fascination, that cannot be shaken off. His

* "The Second Death and Restitution of all Things," p. 10.

Digitized by Google

character while on earth was much too beautiful not to force admiration from the world which now, as of old, confesses, "Never man spake like this man." Truth is in fact very much to us what we are to it. "To the merciful thou wilt show thyself merciful, and with the upright thou wilt show thyself upright; with the pure thou wilt show thyself pure, and with the froward thou wilt show thyself froward."

Our Lord always prefaces his remarks with the words: "He that hath hears to ear let him hear." In other words, the door of truth is never *closed* to any one, and those who patiently persevere in its pursuit will sooner or later be rewarded by finding it. Truth or wisdom is not indeed easily to be obtained,—long and careful pursuit is necessary before such a treasure can be found. "Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors; for whoso findeth me findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord." In exact accordance with this, we never find our Lord *entreating* any to follow him, or in the least degree trying to stop them if they wished to go away. Everywhere it is made a *privilege* to be with him, and an honour to be near him. This alone might lead us to surmise that our Lord came not to convert the world, but to call out of it a people for his name.

The fact is our Lord was himself so spiritual that he scarcely seems to be, in one sense, man at all. His eyes and his heart were constantly so fixed on heavenly things that he looked on all earthly things through a spiritual medium. The spirit was with him in such overflowing fulness that he *could not* look at anything save as it bore on the world to come. As a child of twelve years of age we see the exemplification of this, and indeed he seems to have *marvelled* at the unbelief of the world, when even spiritually-minded men would not have done so. *Therefore*, it would seem, was it that he was so frequently misunderstood even by his own disciples, for in all cases *moral sympathy* with God is required as an indispensable pre-requisite to the right understanding of his truth.

I think, therefore, that the Calvinistic argument that our Lord spake in parables because he did not intend any but the elect to hear and understand, is false. He withheld truth purposely, but it was from those who were unfit to receive it; for experience proves most conclusively that if truth be presented to those who are unfitted for it, it invariably causes their last state to be worse than their first. The very curse, "Go and say to this people, Hearing ye shall hear and shall not perceive, and seeing ye shall see and shall not understand," was in accordance with all that God does in the way of judgment, a blessing in disguise, i.e., truth was withheld from them quite as much in mercy as in judgment. This very curse was spoken to men who were the spiritual as well as literal descendants of the people who in the days of Isaiah would not have God for their Lord, but it is abundantly clear that on repentance it would have been removed.

Digitized by Google

St. Mark tells us that, on a certain occasion, our Lord "saw a great multitude and was moved with compassion towards them, and *began to teach them many things*" (Mark vi. 34); and again, "With many such parables spake he the word unto them, *as they were able to hear it*" (iv. 33). Even to the disciples themselves he says, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now;" and in a similar manner St. Paul tells the Corinthians, "I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able." (1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.)

All experience and analogy lead us to expect that, as a rule, in order that the fruit may be perfected, the seed and the soil must be suited to one another.

It should be always remembered that our Lord offers to those who are prepared to follow him whithersoever he leadeth, the privilege of sitting with him in his throne. This, and nothing less than this, is what he offers. But inasmuch as he knew how strait is this gate, how narrow is this way, therefore all his utterances were more or less hidden from those who were not able to hear him. "My sheep," he says, "hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me." These very remarkable words are and have ever been perverted by men of the Calvinistic school, to mean that the sheep cannot help being sheep, nor the goats help being goats, both having been so predestinated by God; whereas attention to the context and to the general spirit of the Gospel shows plainly enough that God will judge all men in righteousness,—will judge them, that is to say, according to their opportunities, and to the gifts bestowed upon them. Truth, like all the gifts of God, is opened out to some and not to all, in accordance, however, with purposes of the highest goodness, mercy, and love towards all. Our Lord, therefore, while never refusing any who came to him earnestly seeking, imparts the highest truths only to a few. His precepts are addressed only to those who are prepared to follow him. How, for instance, can the Sermon on the Mount apply to the world, or to the kings and great ones of the earth, as such? How could a *nation*, as such, exist which acted on such high principles?

No doubt there are in the New Testament some general commands which may be made use of with advantage by governments and kingdoms; but these are merely incidental and altogether apart from its main principles. Christianity has unquestionably in *some respects* proved a blessing to the world, but in many others the attempt to graft Christianity on a Pagan or semi-Pagan stock, has been the means of producing fruit of a most awful character. The great mass of mankind in every age are morally and spiritually unfit to embrace real Christianity, and therefore would have been injured by it. The attempt to explain all our Lord's sayings to his disciples as applying to this world, or in fact to any but those who

Digitized by Google

are morally and spiritually fit to receive them, has been in the past, as it must ever be, disastrous in the extreme. The attempt to embrace as it were the two classes has simply resulted in the setting up of the great mystery of iniquity which still more or less overshadows the earth. It is the old, old story over again, and shows how right and necessary it was that our Lord should not cast pearls before swine. Like Sarah of old the woman (the church) was very fair and was taken into Pharaoh's house. The princes of this world saw plainly enough and commended the beauty of the Bride of Christ; and so, alas! she was taken into power, wealth, and dignity in the kingdoms of this world. Just as it was in those days so is it now, God "plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai, Abraham's wife." And among these great plagues I think one of the greatest is that doctrine which the church when triumphant in this world has always *forced* upon its children, and that which it has been the object of the RAINBOW now for many years to get rid of, viz., the doctrine of eternal suffering. This doctrine which transmuted and changed so fearfully, by distortion, our Lord's words, has indeed been to the world a source of the greatest possible cruelty and horror. It seems to have been more or less of a heathen idea incorporated with a Christian one, and as a horribly unnatural mixture always becomes highly dangerous, so did this doctrine become not only the means whereby all the abominations of the Papacy were perpetrated and protected, but also that by which the glorious character of our Father in heaven has been darkened and falsified.

* T. W.

DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRESSION.

THE science of the age, in its anxiety to rid the universe of a Creator, and leave the human race without God and without hope, has devised all sorts of expedients for starting the world without the presence of an intelligent creating Deity. Hence it has been claimed that the great law of animate existence is the law of development and progression; that all creatures are passing upward to a higher and more perfect state; and that every species will, in the natural course of events, reach the goal of its ultimate perfection. And moreover it is claimed that from some primitive and rudimental form of self-existent life, by the gradual processes of development and evolution, all created beings have in the lapse of time come into existence and reached their present condition. The ingenuity of this theory is unquestionable; it does credit to the inventive powers of its authors. As a curious hypothesis it may have worth, but as a matter of fact there are serious difficulties in its way.

Digitized by Google

It is true that numerous types of vegetable, animal, and rational beings, have their regular gradations and intermediate links, so that many different forms of inanimate and animate life seem to interblend and overlap each other, throughout the whole sphere of physical existence. There are plants which are almost animals; there are animals which are little more than plants. There are beasts that walk upright, and there are men that grovel like brutes in the dust. There are animals that are very wise, and there are men that are very foolish. There are brutes that will obey the voice of command, and there are children who will not. But these different grades of creatures seem to keep their relative places. There are beasts that rise above the level of some men; there are men that fall below the level of some beasts; yet the beast is a beast, and the man is a man, notwithstanding. Culture does not change them, nor do their natures interblend. If it be said that the protracted training of ages may bring a brute up to the level of man in the line of natural progression; it may be replied that it requires no period of ages to degrade a man to the condition of the brute; for let a babe taken from the cradle, be placed in companionship with wolves, and in a few brief years it is so dehumanised that it becomes almost as wolfish and as beastly as its associates: but no beast can be thus easily brought up to the human level. The child without the guidance of its parents and the instruction of its home, learns no language but that of the beasts around it; but those beasts might have all the culture that man is capable of imparting, and they would never come to speak with the tongues of men, nor to manifest human intelligence.

Throughout all history, with the exception of a few beastly barbarians of the lowest type, and a few atheistic instances of perverted culture, the human family have looked up to some higher Power, and have felt the instinct of worship leading them to adore some superior, creating Deity; but there is no evidence whatever that any animal in existence has the slightest notion of a higher being than man, his appointed lord. The beastly intellect runs in a narrow range; the vast capabilities of the human mind are entirely foreign to its sphere. No instance can be found where great herds of beasts of the same species have for successive ages, equipped themselves in uniform, armed themselves with deadly weapons, and gone forth at the bidding of a few pampered and petted leaders, to harass, slaughter, and destroy each other, perpetuating their feuds from generation to generation. No beasts can be found who have learned how to tempt and ruin creatures of their own race, pressing to their lips the cup of madness, taking from them every thing that renders life a blessing, and inflicting on them everything that makes it a bitter curse. No race of beasts were ever known who would work from day to day to acquire money, and then use it to buy [illegible] get crazy on at night. No beasts have learned to whip their mates, as men do their wives. A noted advocate

Digitized by Google

of the theory of development and evolution informs us that to man alone pertains the proud honour of abusing the female of his race. Such undeniable facts as these, show that man belongs to an entirely different species; that he occupies a higher position in the scale of existence; and that Satan, the great adversary, who deems beasts too unimportant to be victims of his wiles, exercises his ingenuity in perverting human instincts, and destroying and ruining man created in the image of his God. He stands highest and he falls lowest. If he refuse to rise to fellowship with angels, he is dragged down, and lies wallowing in sin between brutes and devils.

Proximity is not progress; the fact that certain types of brutal nature stand *near* to man upon the scale of being, is no proof whatever that they ever will stand nearer. Albany is much nearer New York than Chicago, but Chicago will get to New York just as quickly as Albany. A quart jug is more like a gallon than a pint pot is, but it will not become a gallon any sooner. A bean is more like a pea than an acorn is, but will the bean become a pea any sooner than an acorn? When men are running a race, the one who is nearest the goal has the best chance of reaching it, but if instead of a hundred men we have a hundred lamp-posts, the one which is a mile away, is just as likely to move to the goal as the one that stands within a rod of the place. A flight of stairs has twenty steps; the middle one is much nearer the top than the first is, but the bottom step will reach the top just as soon as the nineteenth. They occupy positions in regular gradation, but their positions are fixed and unchangeable; the first step never becomes the fifth, and the fifth never becomes the twentieth. A man climbing the steps, when he has reached the nineteenth is quite sure to reach the top; but the step itself remains for ever where it was.

In surveying the varieties of physical life we may note the gradation, the seeming interblending of forms and types; but these types remain ever unchanged in their relation to each other. If you should interrogate an ancient frog regarding his origin, he might blink solemnly and tell you that he came in the order of progressive development from the spawn or egg, through the rudimentary tadpole state, and up to his present amphibious exaltation; and he might tell you that he felt something stirring within him, which was to him a grand prophecy that a yet higher destiny awaited him,—that he should leave the region of mud and bog, and stand upon a firmer footing in a more exalted state. He might verify his theory of progression, because he could show us the process continually going on; the spawn, the tadpole, and the frog, in all their conditions of growth, transformation and development; but all this manifestation is seen to be within his narrow limit; nothing of the kind is observed when we pass beyond that restricted circle. The tadpole becomes a frog, but the frog *does not* become a sceptical scientist. We find no instance of this progression or

Digitized by Google

transformation in the relations of the different races. The monkeys of to-day are like the monkeys of three thousand years ago; the gorillas of to-day are like the gorillas which Herodotus described before the Christian era. Thousands of years have gone by, and no instance has been observed where this wonderful transformation was taking place. Different types may be perfected or impaired; races may, by careful attention be improved or deteriorated; but still the ancient laws, inwrought in the very constitution of things, hold the vital forces of the universe in their steady, equable play.

And if we were to admit the fancies and the theories which have swarmed from the seething brains of the wise men of this world, we have yet no solution of the question of the origin of all things. In the beginning was God, and to every race there must be a beginning; to every form of life there must be a source, no matter how low, no matter how rudimentary the form may be; a grain of sand can no more make itself than the universe could. The lowest form of material existence or vegetative life is as unequal to its own creation as the great philosophers of the day are to the creation of a mosquito or a fly. The power of life springs from the hand of God, and all the wise men and great men of the world could not bring back life to one withered leaf, or restore the wing of a dismembered butterfly. The mystery of creation is hid in God; the forces of being spring from Him: the types and forms of animate life are born of His Omniscience. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made."—*The Armoury.*

THOUGHTS ON CHRISTIAN WORK AND OUR CHRISTIAN CONDITION.

LETTER III.—*Christian Work through Christian Culture.*

IT is perhaps needless to say that by Christian culture I do not mean the possession of any of the varied attainments that belong to the accomplished theologian. These can only be obtained by a favoured few, and are the peculiar property of the learned.

The culture I am anxious to promote, and in the absence of which, as I think, Christian work must be very imperfectly performed, is of a different kind, and is one that may be more or less acquired by persons in all conditions of life. I mean by it that wide acquaintance with the will of God and the true meaning of Scripture which, as the reward of diligence, and the effect of reflection and prayer, may be gained by the ordinary reader of an English Bible, in spite of occasional errors in translation, and of sundry liabilities to mistake. I mean by it that indefinite, but invaluable tone of mind, which comes from "spirit speaking to spirit;" that quickened apprehension of divine things, which is occasioned by affinity with all that is divine; that purified and elevated state of the whole man which is essential to enlarged spiritual perception, and

Digitized by Google

which, as the result of communion with the Holy Spirit, is, to a great extent, independent of external aids. I mean, in short, by it that power of insight which, while inseparable from profound attention to what is written, and the active use of every faculty we possess, is yet something more, and something higher,—even that "unction of the Holy One," with the possession of which the Apostle John credited his converts when he bade them "try the spirits, whether they are of God," adding, "The anointing which ye have received abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you."

Christians, it is to be feared, neglect what is essential to the obtaining of this Divine gift, when they say that such is the incessant demand made upon their time and energy, that it is impossible they should devote themselves to the study of Scripture, to any extent that would justify their forming *an independent judgment* as to what it requires of them. The conseqence is that, not unfrequently, persons distinguished by their zeal in the work of the Lord, are singularly deficient both in charity and in intelligence; are content to depend for such knowledge as they have upon professional instructors; or think it right to adhere, without inquiry, to the doctrines in which they have been educated. Some, of course, will reply that they do this because the views of truth to which they cling have come down from *antiquity;* some, because they have been long honoured by the excellent of the earth; and many more, simply because they have been embodied in the written and unwritten creeds of the various churches to which they belong.

Thus *work* takes the place of *thought*, and young persons, instead of being allowed to mature Christian character in silence, by reading and reflection, are prematurely urged to active participation in undertakings which cannot rightly be carried forward without that "power from on high," which is gained only by experience, by devout meditation, and frequent prayer. Quantity rather than quality seems now-a-days to be regarded in all Christian work, probably because undue importance is attached to results capable of being numbered, tabulated, and rejoiced over, as most encouraging spiritual statistics.

When I have urged these convictions of mine on some of my Christian friends, I have found myself commonly met by replies of this kind:—"You err in supposing that quiet and research are *relatively* as needful as they once were. Divine truth—at least as much as we are ever likely to possess—may now be regarded as in our hands. We live in a time remarkable for progress, and Christians must keep abreast with the spirit of the age. God has cast upon them the duty of conveying the glad tidings of salvation through Christ to every child of Adam. At home and abroad, therefore, we must be up and doing. While we meditate men around us are perishing, and if we neglect to bring truth home to them their blood will be sprinkled on our garments. God has made the eternal salvation of our fellow men to depend on our zeal, or want of zeal, for their conversion. Beyond the brief period of mortal existence the redeeming work of Christ does not stretch. If, therefore, men are not changed by divine grace while on earth, they never can or will be other than eternally depraved, and eternally miserable. Faith in Christ *now* can alone save them, and, if exercised, will infallibly bring in its train divine knowledge, spiritual wisdom, and holy character. There-

Digitized by Google

fore, putting aside everything else, our message to all should be '*Only believe.*'" So good men often speak, and, with a singular amount of self-satisfaction, call this "the simple Gospel."

I have often listened to observations of this kind with very mixed feelings. I have been unable to forget that the Scriptures do not present duty to us in this form. I have never been able to rid myself of the impression that this passion for work is strengthened by many secondary considerations; that its encouragement is favourable to the growth of sects, and indeed to all ecclesiastical interests; that it furnishes an apology for neglecting reflection, a thing singularly distasteful to all whose minds are fashioned by the exciting pursuits of the day; that activity rather than meditation *even on the Lord's day*, is in agreeable harmony with the occupations of the week,—flattering men with the supposition that they are accomplishing great things, and fostering that restlessness and love of enterprise which, more than anything else, characterises the time in which we live.

The assertion that all divine truth may now be regarded as in our possession, is simply a denial of that gradual development of Scripture, which takes place before our eyes as the ages advance. For proof of this we have only to note that during the last century alone the ethical parts of the Gospel, *so far as they bear on human relations*, have become much better understood than formerly. The abolition of slavery, more humane laws, and numberless other improvements have been brought about by the wider diffusion and better understanding of the Scriptures, and we are therefore forced to admit that in these particulars our ancestors, however good they were, held much that was erroneous.

But this improvement has, as yet, only been partial; for, during the same period, no appreciable advance has been made, either as to the better understanding of those *ethical* portions of the Bible which seem to run counter to modern progress, or of those *dogmatic* statements which have moulded our opinions as to what will be *the final dealings of God with the human race.* On these points, with individual exceptions, the Church does not seem prepared to admit the bare possibility that our ancestors can have misconceived the teaching of the Spirit, and so it steadily discourages inquiry.

May I now be permitted very briefly, and at the risk of being charged with egotism, to narrate in conclusion a few personal experiences. Pondering what I have stated I said to myself, "God forbid that I should seek to be wise above that which is written, or be foolish enough to indulge in merely speculative inquiries, to meddle with things unrevealed, or to be dissatisfied where Scripture is silent. But let me not be numbered with 'the fearful.' Let me not *assume* that all truth has come down to us from the days of the Reformation. Let me not, therefore, shrink from examining what I have received because, living as we do, at a time when everything revealed is in the crucible, dangers are many and imminent. If God has more truth to break forth from his holy word, this tendency to question all old beliefs without distinction *may*, for aught I know, be permitted for the strengthening of a faith which is always apt to become relaxed and inoperative. Storms in the physical world deepen and strengthen the roots of our forest trees, and similar agitations

Digitized by Google

in the spiritual world may perchance be essential to the advancement of Divine truth, and to firmness in our hold of it."

Conscience bade me go on. It told me that the searching of Scripture for *hidden* treasure, if undertaken with the fearlessness and earnestness which the miner exercises when digging for precious metals, was a work in which, though I might not enlighten the world, I should certainly benefit myself; the reward being, as in the well-known fable of the farmer and his sons, *in the search itself*,—a process by which insight is developed, patience and dependence brought out, and strength increased through emancipation from that reliance on others which is the source of so much weakness.

Experience has justified the wisdom of the monitor. Passages which had long appeared dark to me, not because I had no eye to discern their meaning, but because, like certain animals which withdraw themselves from the light of day, I had, by not sufficiently using the eye of the mind, all but obliterated the power of vision,—became clear; and the habit of inquiry thus stimulated, has been, in my own case, so far as I am able to judge, every way beneficial. My sense of the excellency and infinite value of Scripture has been greatly increased; my hold on what I had always considered to be its vital doctrines, has been deepened and strengthened; and if, in some important respects, my conception of the *relative* value of what I once thought *ruling* truths has been modified, it has only been in favour of a better balanced view of revelation *as a whole*, and a higher sense of the divine wisdom, love, and forbearing pity, in all the Creator's dealings with the children of men.

Especially was this my conclusion after weighing carefully in the balances of the sanctuary what has recently been written by believing men regarding the eternity of evil, and the possibility of a great restoration in the world to come through the agency of "the elect," acting as "kings and priests" under Christ.

I was led moreover to see, far more clearly than I had hitherto done, that *the perfecting process* in believers, like all the other works of God, is *a slow one*, and that no greater mistake can be made than to imagine, as so many do, that when a man is once really converted to God, every thing essential to his happiness after death is effected. On the contrary I became convinced that what holds in nature, holds also in grace, viz., that God always acts, as if much time and great pains were essential in bringing any of his works to perfection. I now saw that what I had once supposed to be the end was really *the beginning* of a man's divine education, and that it is as unreasonable to suppose that a converted human being, whatever may have been his previous habits, becomes at once a person of strict integrity, truthful, candid, loving, and unworldly, as it would be to imagine that a child, when first born into the world, can exercise at once functions that can only be developed by growth.

When, therefore, the question recurred, as it often did,—"How can I do most good in the world? How can I best glorify God in my life?" I found myself obliged to reply, "Go to Christ, and seek from him what he would have you to do. Rush not into the streets to compel men to come in, but stand apart for a while. Avoid committing yourself hastily to any movement originated by others, however good it may be. Seek *maturity* of Christian knowledge and character, and try to find out your

Digitized by Google

own particular work, which *may* be a very different one from that of others. Instead of following eagerly any banner that may be set up, be quiet until *the heavenly* call comes. Hold yourself ready to do whatever God bids; to speak or to be silent, to be active or passive in his service. "They also serve who only stand and wait." Let then your only anxiety be to *represent* Christ in the world, that so by your heavenly walk you may *win* unbelievers to "the truth as it is in Jesus."

So far as I have been enabled to follow these monitions I have been at rest, and able to look calmly on many things that sadden the Christian heart, without the dismay or doubt they once excited, simply because I am sure that "all things" are under the control of infinite wisdom and love, and that *all things*,—the sin and perversity of man not excepted,—will work out eventually the counsels of the divine will, and be fruitful to those who love God. * HENRY DUNN.

PARAPHRASED PROPHECIES.

V.—DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE EVENTS PRECEDING AND ATTENDING THE CAREER OF THE WILFUL KING IN THE LATTER DAYS.

Daniel x. xi. xii.

IT was in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia that the seventy years' captivity (2 Chr. xxxvi. 21; Jer. xxv. 11, 12; xxxix. 10) of my people Israel came to an end, and they began to return to their own land to rebuild Jerusalem and the sanctuary of the Lord our God:

x. 1-3. And it was in the third year of Cyrus,—that is, four years after it had been revealed unto me that my people should be restored to their own land for seventy sevens of years (Dan. ix. 24), and should afterwards be again overthrown as with a flood, and their land given to perpetual desolations (Dan. ix. 26),—that I Daniel was mourning three sevens of days. I ate no pleasant food, and drank no wine; neither did I anoint myself for three whole weeks [being grieved for my people, for their sins, and for their chastisements].

4. Then, being by the side of the great river Hiddekel (or Tigris), I saw this great vision:

5, 6. I looked, and behold a man clothed in linen and girded with fine gold; his body was like the beryl, his face as the appearance of lightning, his eyes as lamps of fire, his arms and his feet like polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude:

11-21. And he said unto me, "O Daniel, greatly beloved, unto thee am I now sent; for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand and to chasten thyself before God, thy words were heard, and I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for the time appointed is long before it shall come to pass; the vision that I will show thee is for many days, and it is noted in the Scriptures of truth.

xi. 2, 3. "Behold, after Cyrus, three kings, Cambyses, Smerdis, and Darius Hystaspes, shall stand up in Persia; and the fourth, Xerxes, far richer than they all, shall stir up all his strength against Greece. But Alexander, the mighty king of the Grecians, shall afterwards conquer

Digitized by Google

the Persians and shall take their great dominion (Dan. vii. 7), ruling according to his will.

xi. 4. "At his death the kingdom shall be divided,—not to his posterity, nor according to the dominion as he held it, for Macedon and Babylon shall soon cease to be seats of empire;—but to the four winds (Dan. viii. 8)—to Egypt, to Syria with Persia, to Thrace and Asia Minor, and to Greece with Macedonia; and even for others beside those who shall first obtain dominion; and dynasties and races shall often be changed and supersede one another.

5. "And the king of Egypt (in the south, Dan. viii. 9; xi. 25) shall be strong, and another of the kings shall be stronger than he, and have a great dominion.

6. "And in the end of years (in the latter days, viii. 23; x. 14—for the vision is for *many days*, and the time appointed is *long*) the divided dominions shall associate themselves together (Isa. viii. 9, 10): the south and the north in particular shall attempt it by a marriage; but it shall not prosper; the south king's daughter shall not retain her strengthened position in the north; neither shall the king of Egypt stand or retain his strength; and the daughter shall be given up with all that shall attend her, and he that begat her, and he that shall strengthen her.

7-9. "But one out of a branch of her roots shall stand up in Egypt, and with an army shall enter the fortress of the king of the north, and prevail, and shall carry captive into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and treasures of gold and silver. He shall continue more years than the king of the north, and be established in his kingdom.

10-12. "But the sons of the king of Egypt shall stir themselves up for war and assemble great forces; and one shall certainly overflow and pass through: then shall the king of the north come forth, and be stirred up even to his fortress. And the king of Egypt, moved with choler, shall come forth and fight with the king of the north, who shall set forth a great multitude, but it shall be given into the hand of the king of Egypt, whose heart shall then be lifted up; and he shall cast down many ten thousands, but it will not strengthen him.

13-15. "For the king of the north shall return after certain years with a greater multitude and much riches; many others also shall stand up against the king of Egypt; also the children of robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to fulfil the prophecy before the time: but they shall fall (viii. 10-12); and the king of the north shall take strong cities, and prosper, so that the king of Egypt shall not be able to withstand even with his choicest people and strongest forces.

16, 17. "But he that cometh (? from the west) against the king of the north shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: he shall enter the holy land and consume it, endeavouring to bring in the whole strength of his kingdom, and upright ones with him; thus shall he do: and *he* shall give *him* (that is, *he that cometh* shall give to the *king of the north*, or the *king of the north* shall give to *him that cometh*) the daughter of women, corrupting her; but she shall not stand on the side of him that cometh, neither be for him.

18, 19. "After this shall he that cometh turn his face to the isles and take many: but a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him that cometh to cease; without reproach to himself the

Digitized by Google

prince shall cause the reproach to turn upon him that cometh. Then he that cometh shall turn toward the fort of his own land; but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found.

20. "Then in his place shall stand up in the glory of his kingdom a raiser of taxes; but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle.

21, 22. "Then a vile person shall stand up in his place, to whom the high estates of the realm shall not *give* the honour of the kingdom; but the vile person shall come in peaceably, and by flatteries *take* the kingdom. And with the arms of a flood (Rev. ix. 1-11) shall they (who oppose) be overflown from before the vile person, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant (viii. 11).

23, 24. "And after the league with him (by those from whom he takes the kingdom, or by the prince of the covenant), the vile person shall work deceitfully; for he shall come up and become strong with a small people. He shall enter peaceably upon the fattest places of the province; and do that which his fathers have not done, nor his father's fathers: he shall scatter among them prey and spoil and riches; and forecast devices against the strongholds for a year.

25, 26. "Then the vile person shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south shall come to battle with a very great and mighty army; but the south shall not stand; devices shall be forecast against him, and they that are fed by him shall destroy him, and his army shall overflow (break loose, over-step or overleap bounds, and ravage), and many be slain (Rev. ix. 15, 18).

27, 28. "And the hearts of both these kings (the vile person and the king of the south) shall intend mischief, and they shall speak lies to each other in conference; but it shall not prosper; for the end shall be at the time appointed. Then shall the vile person return into his land with great riches, and his heart set against the holy covenant; and he shall do great acts and return to his own land.

29-31. At the time appointed the vile person shall come again towards the south; but not as the former time (ver. 22), nor as the latter (ver. 25). For the ships of Chittim (the isles of the west) shall come against the vile person: therefore he shall be vexed, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant. Thus shall he act; he shall even return and enter into negotiations with them that forsake the holy covenant. And arms (of the south, under the king of fierce countenance, Dan. viii. 11) shall stand up for the vile person, and shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and place the abomination that maketh desolate (viii. 13, 24).

32, 33. "And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall the vile person corrupt by flatteries: but the people that know their God shall be strong, and do: and they that understand the times and the purpose of God shall instruct many among the people (xii. 3, 10): yet they shall be persecuted and fall by the sword, by flame, by captivity, and by spoil for a certain number of days (vii. 21, 25; viii. 24; Rev. xiii. 7).

34, 35. "Now when they shall thus be persecuted, they shall receive a little help; but even then many shall cleave to them with flatteries:

Digitized by Google

and some even of them of understanding shall fall to try the rest by them, and to purge and make white to the time of the end; because it shall be only for a time appointed (xii. 7).

36-39. "And the king (the vile person, the Wilful King) shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt and magnify himself above every god, and shall blaspheme wondrously the God of gods, and prosper until the indignation against thy people be accomplished (viii. 14; ix. 27); for this is determined and shall be done. Neither shall the king regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire (love or lust) of (or for) women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all. But in the place of the Almighty God the king shall honour a god whom his fathers knew not, with gold, and silver, and precious stones, and pleasant things. Thus shall he do in his strongholds and fortresses with a strange god whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory: and he shall set kings to rule over many, and divide the land of thy people for gain.

40, 41. "And at the time of the end, the fierce king of Egypt from the south (Isa. xix. 4; Dan. viii. 9-23) shall push at the Wilful King, and the king of the north (Ezek. xxxviii. 15, Gog) shall come against him like a whirlwind by land and by sea: and the Wilful King shall proceed into their countries, and shall overflow and pass over. He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many shall be overthrown: but these shall escape—Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.

42, 43. "He shall stretch forth a high hand over the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians at his feet.

44, 45. "But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him; therefore the Wilful King shall go forth with great fury to destroy all thy people, and utterly exterminate the saints of the Most High (vii. 21, 25). And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.

xii. 1-3. "And at that time shall Michael, the strength of God, your Saviour, the great Prince of the children of thy people, appear to set up his kingdom; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation to that same time (Rev. xvi.); and every one of thy people that shall be found written in the book shall be delivered. And many of them shall awake from the dust of the earth (Ezek. xxxvii. 12); some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall be transfigured and shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that instruct the people (xi. 33) and turn many to righteousness shall be glorious as the stars for ever and ever.

4. "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book until the time of the end: it shall not be understood for many days; then many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

xii. 5, 6. Then, when I heard the voice no longer, I Daniel looked, and behold there stood two others, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river. And one

Digitized by Google

said to the man clothed in linen who was above the waters of the river, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?"

7. Then I heard the man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for three years and an half, or a thousand two hundred and seventy-eight days; and when the time for the scattering of the power of the holy people is accomplished (Rev. x. 7; Dan. viii. 24), all these things shall be finished.

8. But though I heard, I understood not.

Then said I, "O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?"

9, 10. And he said: "Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. Until then the righteous and the wicked will continue in the earth (Rev. xxii. 11): but many shall be purified, and cleansed, and tried (xi. 35); and the wicked will be permitted to do wickedly: yet none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.

11. "And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, to set up the abomination that maketh desolate (viii. 13; xi. 31), there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

12. "Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.

13. "But go thou thy way till the end: for thou shalt go to thy rest, and in the resurrection at the end of the days shalt stand in thy lot."

G. B. C.

HEART LONGINGS.

"I will come again, and receive you unto myself."—JOHN xiv. 3.

O JESUS, Shepherd, Lover, Lord;
Thou glorious One, thou Living Word,
On whom alone our hopes rely,
For thee we look, to thee we cry.

Our eyes grow dim, our hearts are faint,
Our strength is weak, our courage spent;
Our hope our foes in mockery spurn,
And say, "He never will return."

O Lord, our Life, our glorious All,
For thee we look, on thee we call,
Our faith revive, our hope renew;
For thou wilt come, for thou art true.

Thy word is passed, thy promise given,
That thou wilt come again from heaven,
To take unto thyself thy bride,
To reign in glory by thy side.

Fulfil thy promise, gracious Lord;
We will not doubt thy sacred word;
We love thee much for all thy grace,
But oh! we long to see thy face.

Digitized by Google

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

ARTICLE IV.

IT will have been seen that both Delitzsch and Perowne agree in several particulars. They both recognise the complete contrast between the spirit of the Old Testament and the New, although the former truly shows that the higher morality of the New was discernible in the Old; albeit only as the gold thread in a tapestry might be traced running underneath the dark background before it reappeared to form the conspicuous colour of the pattern. They both judge the language of the imprecatory Psalms to be unsuitable upon the lips of a Christian, and by inference consent that it is the God of the New Testament whom we are to worship, and to seek to imitate in the spirit of our lives. Both these theologians agree that the human element mingles largely in these Psalms, and so far from supposing David to have been pre-eminently prophetic when engaged in their composition, they account for much of their peculiarity, as we shall see, by laying stress upon the *limitation* of his knowledge of the future.

Now that the eternal Jehovah is also immutable in the character of his attributes; that He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; the same under the old economy as under the new; the same under the present dispensation as he will be in the succeeding one and throughout eternity; none will dispute.

Here then we have revelations of the one true God, so different from one another, on account of being partial and imperfect, as almost to be contradictory; and yet one immutable Jehovah whom neither of them adequately makes known. One revelation however, and that the last, admittedly making him known in a much more perfect manner than the other, and therefore mankind are directed to walk in the light of that last and completest revelation.

To neither Delitzsch nor Perowne, however, is the completest revelation also the highest; for in their strange conception there was one respect in which the old economy differed blessedly from the new. It appears there were some things belonging to the Father of which the world of David's day, and David himself, were kept in blissful ignorance. The curtain that hung before the invisible hereafter had not been drawn up, —the chamber of horrors in the Father's house had not been disclosed. If it had been, thinks Delitzsch, and thinks Perowne, the imprecations of the Psalmist would never have been uttered.

Confounded at the discovery of the immeasurable perdition and the unspeakable awfulness of the sufferings to which the enemies of Jehovah were to be consigned, the Imprecationists would have turned Intercessors, and prayed that the enemies might be treated as, if they could not be turned into, friends; and forgiven, since "they knew not what they did:" which prayer if answered would evidently be much more likely to turn them unto friends, and thus *save* them in the only true sense, than thrusting them into everlasting pains.

We have characterised it as a strange conception thus to account for the unmeasured virulence of invective and studied means for perpetuating the curses which appear in these Psalms; and the more this ex-

Digitized by Google

planation is examined the weaker and worse it becomes. For in the first place, it would be quite possible for a man to pray only for earthly penalties upon enemies and their posterity, in the full knowledge that there were other penalties awaiting the wicked, respecting which he was willing to leave them in God's hands.

In the next place, nothing can be more evident than that the spirit which inspired these utterances would only receive *gratification* from the discovery that, after the utmost possibilities of cursing upon earth had been exhausted, still the infinite possibilities of the world to come remained to be invoked; and invoked they most certainly would be in unmistakable language had the revelation of the future been equal in amount and similar in terms to that made in the New Testament. But further, it appears to us that the implied ignorance of a future state on the part of the Psalmists is here carried to a length that neither commentator would in any other place avow. If ignorance of any thing conspicuously dreadful, or of worse than earthly judgments, pertained to the notions of the Old Testament saints respecting the judgments to come,—then we leave the suggestion to be dealt with by those who maintain that a retention of the dogma of everlasting punishment is essential to keeping down the flood-gates of iniquity.

But to our minds it is impossible thus to limit David's knowledge and intentions. What can be meant by the prayer, "Let the iniquities of his father be remembered with the Lord, and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out?" Was it made upon the supposition that the father and mother were both living? or was it, as the following verse might sanction, that posterity only, not ancestry could have sins visited upon them? What again can be made of this, "Let them be blotted out of the Book of Life and not be written with the righteous." A book is not kept for contemporaneous reference, but for bringing up at a future time the records of the past.

The Psalmists, we maintain, did recognise and refer to future retribution in their imprecations. But they were blissfully ignorant, it is thought, of the possibilities contained in their references. And this is the most extraordinary part of the position taken up by the commentators here referred to. The amazingly false and pitiably low conception of the Gospel is here sanctioned which makes the motive of man's salvation consist in the extremity of his danger and the awfulness of his inherited doom, instead of in the *necessity* of God acting like a God,—that is to say, in the necessity of the Divine Father recognising the claims of children who were created by him, and by him placed in dreadful peril and under overwhelming disadvantages; recognising them so completely as to be ready like any fair type of an earthly father,—but in a way far transcending what is possible to such,—in sacrificing himself for their sakes.

But so far from the coming of Jesus Christ being made a glad evangel to the world, under the notion we are combating, it was at once good news to a few and frightful tidings to the many. In effect the angel should have sung, "Lo, I bring you glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. The Father has sent his Son to set fire to the world, but also to save from the flames as many as shall lay hold on him."

Digitized by Google

Thus, instead of the gift of Jesus Christ appearing as the marvellous, unmerited, superfluous gift of God, it is reduced to the poor level of an act which if not performed under the circumstances would have been deemed immoral in a sinful man.

We now come to consider an explanation which is much more satisfactory than either of those which have been brought before our notice. "T. W." in the March number of this periodical, in an admirable article on "The Servile Interpretation of Scripture," thus deals with this difficult subject. He says,—"I come now to a class of texts which have been and still are to many a great stumbling-block. I do not for a moment profess to be able to satisfy all objections against them. I can only state how these things present themselves to me, and how little they disquiet my own mind when viewed calmly and fairly. I allude to what are called 'the cursing Psalms,' such as, e.g., Psalm cix. 10. It is useless to deny that these Psalms give utterance to feelings and expressions which, whatever they may be, are not Christian, are in fact utterly unchristian. Let us look the matter fairly in the face. Here is David imprecating deadly vengeance on his enemies and wishing that their children may be fatherless and beg their bread, seeking it out also in desolate places: with other similar expressions. All this seems to me distinctly to prove that David was not a perfect man, but that the Spirit of God showed in him, and allowed him to speak, what were the *legal* aspects and the *legal* consequences of such acts as those of David's enemies. Do not the tremendous imprecations in the law and the prophets—those for instance in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah—fully bear out this view? David spake as a man, but his utterances were so overruled by the Divine Spirit as, while being true, yet only to show the legal side of the question. As a matter of fact, did not all these imprecations come true?

"Did not the most awful sufferings befall the Jews, and to this day does not the commission of crime bring the most terrible consequences on the guilty and on the innocent? This world is a world in which law and not *Gospel* reigns. It is inevitably and absolutely necessary, always and everywhere, that law should precede Gospel."

With the exception of the presumption that David's enemies were God's enemies,—with which we have already dealt,—we find this passage to be most valuable in its suggestions—much more helpful than anything we have hitherto had from the commentators.

It is undeniably true that David's most imperfect character, venting itself in these imprecatory Psalms, which no Christian can lawfully imitate, is yet, if God is to be judged by the curses and imprecations of the law and the prophets, or by the facts of history, no unfaithful representation of the character of God himself. For it is certain that the curses in Deuteronomy, in Jeremiah, and in Ezekiel, and still more the actual inflictions upon innocent descendants of guilty parties, exceed in awfulness such invocations of the imprecatory Psalms as have reference to this life only.

And yet it remains undeniably true that if we were to infer from these facts that God was truly represented by the imprecatory Psalms and by David as a type, we should be griveously in error. For it is obvious to the most cursory reader that the spirit of the Old Testament

Digitized by Google

is entirely different to the spirit of the New, and the condemnation to each one of us is that we do not welcome and walk in the light of the last manifestation of God in the flesh, recognising in him the glory of the Father—the χαρακτηρ, express image, of his person. Holding fast to what we see God to be in Jesus Christ, in spite of law and Psalm, and prophets and history, and facts of every day experience,—triumphantly exclaiming in joyous confidence, "He is not here" "These are but a part of his ways." I do not find him in *anything* which does not remind me of Christ and speak to me of the one eternally throbbing pulse of suffering life and love.

What is truly set forth by "T. W.," and also by Perowne, is that David well represented the spirit of his own dispensation, but not the spirit of the new. The spirit of the old dispensation, however, still reigns in the facts of the world. The conclusion we draw is that neither do these facts any more than the spirit of David and of the old economy reveal to us the essential attributes of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and by this conclusion we again depreciate the worth of Butler's famous argument. "T. W." continues: "The difficulty felt in connection with these Psalms arises then, as I venture to think, from two erroneous views. First, that these imprecations refer to *futurity*—which they certainly do not—and, secondly, that in spite of St Paul's distinct assertion to the contrary they are construed to mean simply curses and nothing more. We thus in fact put ourselves, consciously or unconsciously, into the position of the supposed objector in the Epistle to the Romans, and are really arguing that 'they stumbled *in order that* they might fall.' I need not say that St. Paul at once denies this, and declares plainly that not only was that view false, but that God would actually bring out of that stumbling greater good. The proper way, therefore, to interpret such language, as it seems to me, is, as it were, to look at the sunlight under the cloud. The curses of these Psalms, like all curses pronounced by God, are easily and naturally turned into blessings, just as the original primeval curse, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,' is in reality not a curse, but a blessing. Even so, under the dark threatenings and frownings of the law, of which many of the Psalms are simply the exponents, may be seen the glory and the beauty beyond. God is a being who constantly evokes good out of evil, and makes that very evil subservient to good."

Here again we find most valuable suggestion. We have given reasons for taking exception to the statement that the writer of the imprecatory Psalms never contemplated futurity, but we are well assured that the inherited penalties of that law "of which many of the Psalms are simply the exponents," end with the termination of the life which furnishes the means for their infliction. And not only so, but we have here suggested the extreme probability of *compensation* in another world for the real, though to us partly inscrutable, necessity that the innocent should be made to suffer involuntarily for conduct not their own.

We do not find support for this expectation in the unaccountable remark that "the original primeval curse is in reality not a curse but a blessing,"—which we cannot for a moment receive,—but we do rely upon the argument of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans and upon what is predicted as to succeed the removal of the curse from the earth.

Digitized by Google

We have too a firm faith in the unity of God's government, and the impossibility of the signal tragedies of earth being displayed to an incognisant universe. It should never be lost sight of, that the world does not live to itself, or suffer to itself, or die to itself. The suffering life of man is set forth as a spectacle to angels and spirits, co-extensive it may be with the entire spiritual universe, and not a babe is trodden under the wheels of ruthless law, or grown man suffers damage in fighting with temptations which his great grandfather sowed within his soul, but some essential moral service is rendered to the universe.

It is with a gasp of joy sometimes that one involuntarily tots up some discernible fragments of the multitude of persons who are in conditions of life that extort the unavailing sigh from happier men, and surely too from still happier angels. When crowded cities bear witness to their numbers, when bulky government returns record the vast army whom civilisation condemns to varying forms of industrial disease, when the drunkenness of parents is known to enmesh thousands of children in equal misery, if not equal vice,—when paupers beget and train up paupers, and when the *necessity of living* is seen to be the prolific mother of fraud, of lying, of heartless competition, of relentless down-treading of the weaker, not the worse; of loathsome puffery, of exhausting and barren labours, of all sorts of questionable expedients that have the promise of filling empty stomachs, of a debased Christianity, and of vice itself: when systems of superstition draw a black veil which quenches heavenly light between the soul and God: when generations of hapless heathen rise and fall before the unsteady mental gaze: when the multitude of the unprivileged grows with the extended span of their sufferings, snares, wants, and lack of remedies: when the flail of the wrath of God, missing the real culprits, seems to descend with unmitigated force upon the innocent remainders: *then*, knowing that the highest glory needs the thickest veil—that the dark reign of questionable justice is the veil in which God's mercy is enfolded, and that to those who suffer vicariously there is after blessedness in a lovelier world—the heart begins to be greedy almost of calamities; for they seem the most positive witnesses to the vastness of the good that will befall the human race hereafter. If the unprivileged were the few and the thankless privileged the many, it would test one's faith to understand how "the multitude whom no man can number" was to be made up; but now in such a world as this, Faith plumes her wing and counts the redeemed in the number of the lost. Let news of evils come not singly but in battalions, it only sets the faith-inspired soul upon its singing perch. As water rebelling against consistency ceases to contract before the frost and suddenly expands at zero, so the heart upon which the knowledge of accumulated ills is heaped, when freezing also swells with hope divine, and mounting on the last piled agony of mortality descries eternity's bright sun shooting its cheerful ray above the blood-dyed waves of time.

HENRY DEACON.

(To be continued.)

Digitized by Google

THE SPIRIT OF MAN THAT IS IN HIM.

QUERY :—"Will you favour me and others who may be curious about the subject, with an exposition of the passage in 1 Cor. ii. 11—'What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.' Does not this passage seem to teach the existence of an intelligent spirit in man? And surely this is something different from the breath of life."

OUR querist, like querists in general, has made up his mind beforehand as to what the proper answer to his question should be. This is manifest in his closing sentence.

The question, however, is a fair one; and we shall try to give the exposition sought, as concisely as possible. And, in the first place, remark that this passage does seem to teach that there is "an intelligent spirit *in* man," distinct from the man himself; but it can only *seem so* to those who look at it in the light of a foregone conclusion, instead of a careful attention to the phraseology of Scripture. Suppose a person who had been taught that *the heart* of man is possessed of intelligence or knowledge; and who had been rather inattentive to the usage of Bible phrases, should fall in with such a passage as: "The heart knoweth his own bitterness" (Prov. xiv. 10), he would, in all probability, regard that passage as a proof of the doctrine he had received; and, very likely produce it in favour of his peculiar belief. And certainly he would have as good ground for his doing so, as our querist has for quoting the passage under consideration, as *seeming* evidence that the spirit of man within him is, in itself, possessed of intelligence.

If our querist would apply the same rule to 1 Cor. ii. 11, that he does to Prov. xiv. 10, he would not draw the inference from it which he has done.

The doctrine underlying our querist's remarks, not only assumes the existence of an intelligent spirit *within man;* but also that that spirit is distinct and separate from man—a living, intelligent, conscious entity within man—and no more the man himself than the dweller in a house is the house in which he dwells. Nay, more, that *a man* knows nothing more concerning himself, the things which belong to him being known only to *his spirit which is in him.* More than that, the alleged teaching of the passage implies that "the Spirit of God" is distinct from God, and that "the things of God" are known only to his Spirit. "Even so the things of God knoweth no man (Greek, *no one*) but the Spirit of God."

We have treated the passage thus analytically to make it the more manifest that the idiomatic use of the language employed *must* be attended to as well as its etymology, in order to apprehend its meaning; and we have only now to remind our querist that the term *spirit*, in Scripture, both in reference to God and to man, is often used to express the idea of *self* or personality. Reference to a Concordance will soon verify this observation. In strict accordance with the usage of Scripture language, we understand the import of the passage to be this—"What man knoweth the things of a man save the man himself, even so no one knoweth the things of God but God himself."

In further illustrating this idiom, we refer to the circumstance that not only man's *spirit*, but also his *heart*, *reins*, and *bowels* have intelligence

Digitized by Google

and emotion predicated of them in Scripture; and that in all such cases the terms *heart*, *reins*, and *bowels* are used for the person possessing them, e.g., "The heart knoweth his own bitterness," i.e., "Man's sorrow is known best to himself;" "Yea, my reins shall rejoice," i.e., "I will rejoice" (Prov. xxiii. 16); "Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels," i.e., "*in yourselves*" (2 Cor. vi. 12). In all these, and similar cases, *spirit* might be substituted for *heart*, *reins*, with the same result. A part or property of the man is spoken of as being the man himself.

The inference, therefore, that the apostle's language implies that the spirit of man is an individual intelligent conscious entity, is as unwarrantable as would be the inference, that the *heart*, *reins*, *bowels*, &c. are endowed with sentiment and intelligence.

The meaning we have assigned to the language of 1 Cor. ii. 11 is not only in harmony with the usage of Scripture, but in strict keeping with the sense of the context. The Apostle affirms that the things which God has prepared for those that love him are beyond the power of human ken; and that they were known to him and his fellow apostles, simply because God had revealed his purposes to them by his Spirit which he had given them; which things they also spoke, not in words suggested by human wisdom, but in words taught them by the Holy Spirit. It is in illustration of this doctrine that he uses the language quoted by our querist, and the import of which we have submitted as being, "What man," i.e., "No man knoweth the things or purposes of a man save the man himself; even so the things or purposes of God knoweth no one but God himself."

The holy Scriptures give no countenance to the idea that the spirit of man is other than a possession conferred on him by the Divine Author of his being—a possession which he only shares with the inferior animals. "There is indeed no word descriptive of man's inner nature which is not also used to describe that of the animals. If a man possesses a *nephesh*, soul or life, as in Gen. ix. 5 ('at the hand of every man's brother will I require *eth nephesh*, the life of man'), so do they. 'Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh, for the *nephesh*, the soul or life of the flesh, is in the blood' (Lev. xvii. 14). 'Ye shall not eat the *nephesh*, the life or soul, with the flesh' (Deut. xiii. 23). If man possesses a *ruach*, 'spirit of life' (Gen. vi. 17), so in biblical phraseology do they. 'Who knoweth the spirit of a beast that goeth downward?' 'They have all one *ruach*' (Eccles. iii. 19, 21.) 'All in whose nostrils was the *nishmath-ruach chajim*, breath of the spirit of life (which includes the animals, see ver. 21) died.' (Gen. vii. 22.) The spirit which is in man is of a superior order, as 'the candle of the Lord;' he has 'more wisdom than the beasts of the field,' nevertheless he shares spirit with all animated natures, although they do not bear 'the image of God.'" (Life in Christ, p. 103.)

Our querist is right when he says that the breath of life cannot be possessed of intelligence; but we are at the same time mindful of the fact that the possession of this "breath of life" is indispensable to our possessing knowledge; for, saith the word of God regarding man, "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." (Psalm cxlvi. 4.) W. LAING.

Digitized by Google

THE COLONISATION OF PALESTINE.

(From recent Jewish Chronicles and other papers.)

"AT the present moment, it appears to us, that the design Providence seems to work at would be best promoted if, in the dissolution of the Turkish Empire—which cannot be very far off—England were impelled to extend her protecting hand over *Syria*. No contingency would be hailed by *the Jewish people* with greater satisfaction than such a turn of affairs in the East. England has given so many prooofs of her friendly feeling towards the Jewish people, that they could not wish to see the land of their forefathers under a safer keeping than that of Great Britain. Whatever government is in power—whether it be liberal or conservative—there is no difference in the behaviour to the Jews. And, if the English are not the brethren of the Jews "according to the flesh"—as is contended by those who maintain that the Anglo-Saxons are from the ten tribes,—they certainly act towards them as kinsmen, in spirit and feeling. We have given expression to our heartfelt wishes in the matter; but Providence will, of course, go its own way. We must quietly await the disentanglement of the complications becoming thicker and thicker in the East. The solution of the problem cannot be delayed much longer." —*Jewish Chronicle.**

"The dreaded Eastern question has at last come to the front. If an immediate solution is pressed, a fierce struggle must and will ensue. The Turk will not readily submit to the dismemberment of his dominions; he will die hard. And what will be *England's* part in this strife? Not another Crimean war; she will not risk, a second time, valuable lives and precious treasure to aid those who cannot or will not aid themselves. But one thing England must and will do, for her self-protection. The nearest way to her Indian Empire must remain open to her; she must obtain the suzerainty of Egypt, and the sovereignty of Syria and Palestine. Let it, for a time, remain in the keeping of England; it is quite safe in her hands. Let it remain in her hands until the *savagery* has been subdued, its wastes built up, and it has become fit to be a high road for the nations of the earth. Let it remain in the beneficent power of England, until a highway is made through the desert, and Jerusalem and Cairo be joined by an iron path. We have no wish to penetrate into the mysteries of the future; and we must patiently await the unfolding of the designs of Providence. This much, however, we may say that, if Israel is to be indebted to any *human agency* for the realisation of her highest hopes, from none would she accept this service with greater satisfaction than from the power which, of all others in Europe, has manifested the profoundest veneration for the sacred records entrusted to Israel, as also for the holy men who have been instrumental in their composition; and which has, in modern times, exhibited such a warm and sincere interest in her fate."—*Jewish Chronicle.*

"Sir Moses Montefiore—now in his 90th year—has again, for the seventh time, left his own quiet home to visit the land of his fathers. Before leaving England he presided at the opening of some schools in

* The Jews' leading organ.

Digitized by Google

Stepney for Jewish children. The hymns sung by the children on that occasion were—"The Past," "The Present," and "The Future." In the former two, the burden runs, "all is lost." *Not* so in the last sung, "*The Future*," of which the following is a transcript:—

"THE FUTURE."

"The Sun of Righteousness shall rise."

"All is not lost! In yonder skies,
I see the gleams of hope arise.
Star of the East, thy glimmering ray
Is brightening to the perfect day.
Again shall Judah's flag, unfurled,
Wave forth its signal to the world!
Again shall cattle crowd the plain;
The fields be rich with golden grain;
Her towers with busy voices ring;
Her swains rejoice; her maidens sing!
See! in yon East the glowing gleam;
Faith is not false; nor hope a dream.
Messiah comes: rejoice, our eyes!
And, lo! in yonder eastern skies,
The Sun of Righteousness shall rise;
And on its healing pinions bear
Love, peace, and joy, for all the world to spare.
—*Jewish Chronicle.*

"There is a curious theory abroad in connection with the recent purchase of the Suez Canal shares. According to this, the acquisition of a strong influence in Egypt—towards which the purchase of these shares is a considerable step—will involve further action of a most remarkable kind. Should the collapse of the Ottoman Empire come about—as seems now inevitable—and, should Russia claim a large share of the spoil—as seems only too probable—the English position in Egypt—so runs the tale—would be exceptionally weak on the side of Syria and Palestine. It must then become a matter of necessity for England to acquire a position in these countries; if not absolutely to undertake their possession. But let England be once the paramount power in Palestine, and the signal is given for the return of the Jews to their own land. That this should come about under English auspices, is said to be the hope of Mr. Disraeli himself. Whether that be so or not, it would be a most worthy ambition for any English statesman, that his country should have the honour of aiding in the fulfilment of the old promises, and helping to restore the chosen people to the land which is, certainly, to be theirs again. It is curious to see how people's thoughts are beginning to turn in this direction."—*Evening Standard.*

"We are astonished at the apathy with which the majority of professed believers in the Bible regard the present condition of the Turkish Empire. Politicians and speculators in foreign securities, are recklessly anxious; but professing Christians are profoundly indifferent to the most astounding facts of modern history, confirmatory to the Divine inspiration of that Book on the veracity of which their hopes for eternity are based. That the Turkish Empire is on the verge of dissolution, no one of common intelligence who reads the newspapers, has any doubt; and every one who has even a moderate acquaintance with the Christian

Digitized by Google

literature of the last two hundred years, knows, that the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire—once the *terror* of Europe—has been confidently expected by the earnest students of prophecy to take place—as *the crisis* of a gradual decay—about *this* time. In a small volume, entitled, 'The Predicted Downfall of the Turkish Power, the Preparation of the Ten Tribes,' published by the late Rev. George Stanley Faber, in 1853, we read as follows:—'With our best commentators, I consider the downfall of the Ottoman Empire to be clearly predicted in Scripture. Hence, whenever the distinct time shall arrive, all the complications of modern political diplomacy will be found totally unable to prevent the ruin of that once formidable empire. The downfall of the Ottoman Empire, let it come when it may is a matter of most Scriptural importance. It will prepare the way for the return of the ten tribes; and *their* return will synchronise with the return of the two tribes. The way will be "prepared" by the removal of an obstacle; though it does not therefore follow that Israel will instantaneously avail itself of that preparation. The subversion of the Turkish Power will evidently occasion—as all seem to anticipate—a fearful general war. As to particulars, we would not venture farther than Scripture doth, as it were, take us by the hand. Of this, however, we are certain, that the downfall of Turkey will be the harbinger of the resurrection of Israel.'—G. S. F. Already, the politicians of Europe are distributing the effects of the Turk between Russia, Austria, and England. Egypt is the portion assigned to England; this, we suppose, will include Palestine; and, if so, it is likely to be restored to its rightful owners, the descendants of Abraham. It is not for us to know the times and seasons; but of this we are firmly convinced, that, at no distant time, the Turkish Empire will fall, and its fall will be followed by the restoration of the Jews,—of which the prophets have so clearly and so fully written. The fact that England has purchased the interest of the Khedive of Egypt in the Suez Canal is very suggestive."
—*Achill Herald.*

"FAITH, HOPE, AND CHARITY."

WHAT peace of mind it brings
To many a sin-sick soul,
To know the simple touch of *faith*
In Christ hath made them whole.

But oh! the joy it brings
To those who live by Thee,
And rest upon the "blessed *hope*;"
Thy glory they may see.

And they who these possess
May calm and patient be
Amid the ills and wrongs of life
To bear with *charity*.

The triune graces join,
And where they do abound
In love to God and love to man,
True happiness is found.

L. L. WADESON.

Digitized by Google

CORRESPONDENCE.

A COINCIDENCE AND SUGGESTION.

DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to point out in the pages of the RAINBOW a Scripture coincidence, as I think, and to offer a suggestion based thereon.

The coincidence is found in the genealogical account of Jesus Christ as given in the first chapter of Matthew, in which, after enumerating the names of his ancestors from Abraham downwards, it is divided into three periods of fourteen generations each, and so making in all forty-two generations. Now in addition to the figure 42, I think there is a further and a more significant coincidence in the multiple of this figure by the number of years which constitute a generation in Scripture. And on turning to the 11th chapter of Genesis, verses 10 to 26, I cannot doubt that "thirty years" in round numbers constitute such a generation. Thus then multiplying the 42 generations by 30 years, a total is reached of 1260 years. Now the coincidence lies in the fact of these two figures—42 and 1260—being the same as have puzzled, and that continue to puzzle, prophetical students of Scripture.

And now for the suggestion. Assuming the principle of the year-day theory to be, on the whole, a correct one for understanding the several periods of 1260 days, and its corresponding terms of 42 months, time, times, and half a time, and others, the difficulty has ever been to fix on the correct year to date from. Yet, despite the difficulty, various dates have been named with more or less degree of certainty, but only one and all to be falsified by time. Now, in reading the Revelation, I have been as anxious as any to know the signification of these periods of time that are found there, believing that the right understanding of these might lead to the right understanding of much that is contained in this very mysterious, yet doubtless most valuable, portion of Scripture. And it was while so engaged just lately that I was led to suggest to myself whether these periods of time are definite in so far as they admit of human measurement by days, months, and years, or whether, except in the mind and purpose of God, they express anything more than a dispensational period, and so not admitting of arithmetical computation. And this was suggested to me by the coincidence I have stated, and which I had found out long before. For, be it observed, that while the forty-two generations, when added together in the way I have shown, make only 1260 years, the real chronological period from Abraham to Christ was, according even to the accepted chronology of our Bible, about 2000 years. So that in this way we get two sets of days and years; the one historical and that can be computed, but the other, in a sense, arbitrary, and this not without a reason.

What then if the present dispensation between Christ's first and second coming has its two sets of days and years: the one arbitrary or accommodating, as found in the apocalypse, and the other historical but not ascertainable until prophecy becomes history? But does it thence follow that if these figures are untrustworthy, if not valueless, for the purpose for which they have

Digitized by Google

been used, that we are then left in the dark and quite without a clue as to our whereabouts in the history of a groaning creation which waits for the manifestation of the sons of God? By no means. We are then thrown back on perhaps the only clue which God has vouchsafed to his people, viz., the signs of the times. These are given, and that for the very purpose that we may know whether and when our redemption draweth nigh; and if our Master rebuked certain for not discerning them, what will he say if we, his disciples, despise them, or are lacking the wisdom to discern them? True, these will afford little more than an approximate idea as to the times and the seasons, but where are we promised anything more than this? while on the contrary we are told that "of that day and that hour knoweth no man."

It may be that the necessities of the case require that the exact time, to the month and the year, be kept locked up a secret in the bosom of the Father. And by "the necessities of the case" I have in my mind, at least, two reasons which might render such a course expedient, viz., first, because of the ever binding obligation on Christians to watch always, not knowing at what hour their Lord may come; and second, because of the power that devils and men possess to thwart, for a time, the accomplishment of the purposes of God. And it is because of this latter reason that I am the more convinced that the figures 42, 1260, and such like, in Revelation do not admit of arithmetical computation; or else would "the wise and prudent," and "them that are without," be as well able as the "friends" of Christ to calculate and reach the result. For, given a starting point from which to date the 1260 years, the matter then becomes easy enough even to an ordinary school-boy. And as the like source for obtaining a starting point in profane history lies open to all, it is equally difficult or easy to the man of the world as to the Christian to obtain it. A state of things which I cannot believe was ever contemplated when we call to mind such Scriptures as Dan. xii. 10; Matt. xi. 25; Mark iv. 11, 12; Luke xxi. 34, 35; 1 Thess. v. 2-4, all which seem to limit the knowledge of pre-eminently the last things to those who will do God's will. But if instead of days and years being the criteria by which we can measure the nearness of our Lord's approach, it be by means of "signs," and those signs chiefly of a spiritual and moral nature, then I think I can see how it becomes possible for those "who love his appearing," to live in the land of Goschen, concerning these matters, while all others are in Egyptian darkness. For the world has neither the will nor the capacity to gauge that which is spiritual and moral.

But why 1260 rather than any other number should be used to express an indefinite period, i.e., indefinite in the sense in which I have explained, I have not thought to presume to say. I will now leave my suggestion, which I have based on what will be admitted to be a coincidence, and one. I think, worthy of notice, to the consideration of your many able contributors.

With Christian respects and obligations, I am yours truly,

Barnsbury. THOS. HOWE.

SPIRIT.

DEAR SIR,—I have once more to apologise for misrepresenting Mr. Constable, as he has pointed out in his letter in this month's RAIN-

Digitized by Google

now. I beg to assure you and him that the representation was unintentional on my part. I would much rather minimise than exaggerate any difference there is between us, and I am glad to find that it is really so much less than I had thought it.

Mr. Constable does not, I find, "deny the continued living existence of Paul's spirit in the intermediate state." What he does deny is that this "spirit" though in "continued living existence" is an "entity or person." I did not say it was a "person," nor do I now deny that it is. But I confess I cannot understand how a human spirit or anything else in "living existence" can fail to be an "entity" at any rate. Paul's spirit though an "entity" was not a *separate* entity while he was in the body, but has certainly been if in "living existence" a separate entity ever since.

In 2 Cor. v. 1-8 he speaks of something he called himself—I or we—as being now in the tabernacle dwelling or clothing of the mortal body; of being unclothed of it for a time; and being, at a future time that has not come yet, clothed upon with his house from heaven and no longer naked. What is it that he speaks of as now in this tabernacle, as unclothed in death, as clothed upon in resurrection? Surely Mr. Constable will agree with me that it is his spirit as distinct from his body. And yet Paul speaks of it as *himself* all through.

So Peter (in 2 Pet. i. 13, 14) says that he "must shortly put off his tabernacle" in the death by which his Lord had told him he should glorify God. Clearly he speaks then of his soul or spirit as himself distinct from the tabernacle body he was to put off. He leads us on irresistibly to think of himself as having put off his tabernacle—as being unclothed of that dwelling—like a tenant turned out of his tent, and like a man stripped naked of his vile raiment but not having yet put on his goodly apparel instead. If this is not to speak of his disembodied spirit as not only in "continued living existence" but as a "living entity," I protest I know not the meaning or the force of plain words.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,
W. T. Hobson.

St. Barnabas' Parsonage.
Douglas.

LITERATURE.

Is Eternal Punishment Endless? By an Orthodox Minister of the Gospel. Boston (U.S.): Lockwood, Brooks, & Co.

An able and learned book, in which the philological argument is used, fairly and conclusively, against the "endless" horror.

The Second Coming of the Lord, considered in Relation to the views promulgated by the Plymouth Brethren, and so-called Evangelists. By John Laing, M.A., Minister of Knox Church, Dundas, Ont. Toronto: C. B. Robinson.

It is no business of ours to vindicate the views "promulgated by the Plymouth Brethren" respecting the Second Advent, but certainly they are far more in harmony with Scripture than "the views promulgated" by Mr. John Laing. When

Digitized by Google

a man says, "We see good reason to hold fast by the faith delivered to the saints in past ages, and as handed down by our fathers in the Westminster Standards," we feel it useless to say another word, as he assumes unity of testimony between witnesses that notoriously disagree. On the ground of Scripture we are prepared to meet any man; but as even over the theology of the land of Knox the "Standards" will not float much longer, Mr. Laing's wisdom would be to put them aside, and examine the doctrine of the second coming under the guidance of Paul and John, ay, and let us add, of the blessed Master himself. And why the unworthy sneer—"so-called Evangelists?" Has not the Lord owned them? The words are not only destitute of charity, but of manliness.

The Yale Lectures on Preaching. By Rev. Philip Brooks, Trinity Episcopal Church, Boston, U. S. London: R. D. Dickenson.

HERE are some well expressed counsels about the qualifications and work of the preacher; but happy the preacher who does not need them! All this sort of thing is so artificial, savours so much of the wisdom of man, that we dislike it heartily. You can't make preachers by rule, no more than you can make poets.

A Lecture to the Working Men's Club, Maidstone. By H. D. H. Burnell.

MR. BURNELL'S counsels to working men are admirable. Sobriety, intelligence, integrity, and true manliness would result from the adoption of these counsels. Against intemperance, the dire effects of which he has seen in connection with our Metropolitan prisons, Mr. Burnell speaks most earnestly, both in rhyme and reason. We wish him great success in his present benevolent work—that of obtaining employment for discharged prisoners. He has suffered long for the doctrines of this journal. Our friends might purchase his lecture for circulation among working men. He will send a dozen copies, post free for two shillings. Address, 5, Scott Street, Maidstone, Kent.

The Keys of the Apocalypse. By F. H. Morgan, M.A. London: Elliot Stock.

IT is well to be modest; but a teacher who habitually uses such phrases as, "I think"—"It may be"—"I imagine"—"It may mean"—"I am much inclined to think so," and the like, really *teaches* nothing. Mr. Morgan's object is praiseworthy, but we are obliged to say that he has not shed fresh light on the Apocalypse.

Three Worlds, or Plan of Redemption. By N. H. Barbour. Rochester, N.Y.: C. F. Russell.

THE idea of this work is in 2 Pet. iii.—the world before the flood, that which now is, and the new earth which is promised. Mr. Barbour is entitled to honour for the care and labour he has bestowed on this deeply interesting subject; but his book contains, amidst much truth, not a few doctrines and statements which are not only erroneous but mischievous. The incurable tendency of our American brethren to fix dates for the advent and the resurrection is fatally exhibited in this pamphlet. We say fatally, for it would be death to a book of far greater power than this to say that Christ "left the holy place on Oct. 22nd, 1874;" and that "the resurrection began in the spring of 1875," adding the gross absurdity that "the great mass of mankind

Digitized by Google

are to be raised in the *flesh*, with the animal body." No one can believe these statements, no one should believe them, as they are simply incredible. We are thankful to any brother who teaches that the Saviour's coming will be pre-millennial, but we would have that divine truth kept clear from notions that have no foundation in Scripture.

The Devil and Satan; A Critical Examination of all the Texts in which the words Diabolos and Satan are found in Holy Scripture. By T. W. Good. London: Elliot Stock.

We sincerely believe that Mr. Good thought he was serving the cause of truth whilst writing his pamphlet; but we as sincerely regret that his ability, time, and labour were not devoted to an object more in harmony with Scripture. His attempt to prove that there is no "personal devil" is, of necessity, a failure. The arguments he uses, if valid, would prove that there is no God, a conclusion from which we are sure that Mr. Good's intelligence would shrink with indignation. Christians should not aid the delusions of Satan by teaching that he has no existence.

Endless Sufferings the Doctrine of Scripture. By F. J. B. Hooper, B.A. London: Elliot Stock.

We are surprised and sorry to see Mr. Hooper's name on a pamphlet with this awful title. He should know better. It has been proved over and over again that Scripture contains no such terrible doctrine as that of "endless sufferings." The names of our honoured brethren Minton and White appear very often in the publication, but they are quite able to take care of themselves. All we need say on the subject is—Endless sufferings *not* the doctrine of Scripture.

The Two Spirits; or, Truth and Error. Being a comparison of the teachings of Rome with the words of Jehovah. By Arthur Gardiner Butler, and Montague Russell Butler. London: Elliot Stock.

Excellent! Protestants should circulate this by the myriad. Rome and the Bible are placed in parallel columns, and a sorry figure the former makes. She speaks for herself, and out of her own mouth she is condemned as an impudent and abominable impostor. For the preparation of this book the Messrs. Butler deserve hearty thanks. It is but a small thing, but it is an instrument of tremendous power.

The Preacher's Analyst. A Monthly Homiletical Magazine. 12 pp., 2d. London: Elliot Stock.

Skilful analyses, with thoughtful and useful hints for preachers on a variety of topics. One of the most valuable features of this new serial is its reference to books on the subjects under notice. This guide both to modern books and standard works on theology will be of great service to many.

What the Gospels teach on the Divinity and Humanity of Jesus Christ. By A Layman. London: Elliot Stock.

It is only common honesty that books sent for notice should be noticed, although sometimes, as in this case, a book comes to hand so incredibly crude and foolish that it would be charity to throw it aside without a word. We meant to point out a few of the mistakes of this little book, but finding at its close that the writer is "eighty-five," criticism is of course disarmed. We wish the good old man blessings from a higher source, for his authorship will bring him neither gold nor fame.

Digitized by Google

NOTICES.

"S. A. J," sending for copies of "the Ministry of Evil," says, "It is a grand paper, and is well worth circulating." There is no price put upon this tract, and it is not "published," but any friends wishing to circulate it will be supplied with copies on sending a note to the editor's private address, with a few stamps to pay postage.

"The Rich Man and Lazarus," third thousand, price 2d.; and "The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life," third thousand, price 4d, by the editor, may be had of Mr. Elliot Stock, through any bookseller, or direct by post to any address.

"M. W. S." (*inter alia*) says, "By the way, I really wish Mr. Deacon would take a hint about David's relation to the 109th Psalm. It is too bad to continue to blame him for our own blunders."

"ABIJAH."—Ever onwards to higher and nobler issues the Lord's purpose tends. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, but the *Ego*, the personal life that is hid with Christ in God, will be clothed upon with the house from heaven, the spiritual body of resurrection; so that there will be delightful mutual recognition, in the new age, of saints who have toiled and wept and prayed together in the wilderness journey. This is so clearly taught in Scripture that one wonders how the gross absurdity of the resurrection of the physical man, *the same body that dies* —"dust to dust"— ever crept into theology. But, after all, we need not wonder; for it is only one of the many errors which have settled upon Divine truth, like clouds of fog hiding the beauty of a charming landscape. But the Lord will instruct his faithful witnesses as the time of test and testimony approaches; and that time has now most surely come!

"A CITY MISSIONARY" thanks the Lord for the light which we have been honoured to shed upon the sublime doctrine of immortality only in Christ, but mourns over the bondage in which he and his brother missionaries are held. They must be "orthodox" or nothing! We respectfully suggest to the Directors of the London City Mission that it is time to revise both their rules and their creed. Indeed we render a truly Christian service by making the same suggestion to the directors of all our missionary societies, both home and foreign. With all respect for the good and honourable men who have the control of these great organisations, we must warn them that they will speedily lose their constituents by thousands if they impose fetters upon the Christian freedom of their missionaries, or even by implication expect them to teach the falsehoods of natural immortality and the endless torment of the lost.

"ASTERISK."—That "star differeth from star in glory" is an obvious fact, which the apostle selects as an illustration of his sublime theme. The children of the first resurrection will all be children of light, but there will be great variety in their lustre. As the sun, moon, and stars are the gems which crown creation, the world's coronal of beauty; so the raised saints will be the crown of salvation, the coronal of the Life-Giver's work.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

AUGUST, 1877.

THE DISTURBED THESSALONIANS.

"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in the faith, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand."—2 THESS. ii. 1, 2.

THE Christians at Thessalonica seem to have constituted the model church of apostolic times. They certainly enlisted Paul's regard and commendation beyond any other congregation assembled by his labours. We may therefore safely look to them for a truthful and complete exemplification of what true Christianity is. And when we come to inquire narrowly into the nature of their experiences and character, we find their Christianity summed up in two grand articles. In his first letter to them, the inspired apostle says: "Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God;" —this is the first article;—"and to wait for his Son from heaven" (i. 9, 10);—this is the second article. And this was the whole of their Christianity.

From this, then, it appears that the earnest and confident expectancy of the coming of the Lord Jesus from the heavens, was as much and as vitally a part of primitive, practical, and experimental Christianity, as conversion itself; nay, that it was one of the very elements of the early conversions, and one of the great and leading things to which apostolic conversions were made. And it would verily seem from this Scripture, that those who have not been brought practically to take in the doctrine of the Second Advent, are only about half converted. They have turned from serving idols to serve the living God; and so far, their religion may be true and genuine, but, until they have added the other item of waiting for his Son, Jesus Christ, from the heavens, they have only gone half the length of these Thessalonians, and are so far short of being complete Christians. It is a sorrowful statement, and one which bears disastrously upon the claims of much that passes for

Digitized by Google

Christianity in our day; but how to escape from it, with these texts before us is not easy to be seen.

The text quoted gives intimation that the church at Thessalonica had become, to some degree, perplexed and disturbed by certain misrepresentations touching their expectations, which misrepresentations were of a character to change a topic, hitherto their strength and joy, into a source of disquietude and alarm. What was that misrepresentation?

From the reading of the English text, it has been taken that the Thessalonian Christians were in distress and perturbation at the idea of the nearness of the day of the Lord; as if they were afraid of it, alarmed at it, and overwhelmed at the prospect of having Christ to come in their day. It has even been quoted to prove that it is dangerous and anti-apostolic to preach the doctrine of any near or speedy coming of the Lord; that it unsettles people, and robs them of their proper spiritual comforts, and fills them with unnecessary anxieties. But nothing could be further from the facts in the case, or the real meaning of the apostle's words. It is abundantly evident from both epistles that these Thessalonians were the most warmly and joyously interested in the faith and expectation of the near coming of their blessed Lord. They were converted from their old idolatries, and entered the service of the living God, in waiting for that coming. Paul speaks of it as their crown of rejoicing—as their highest and most effective comfort—that the Lord himself was speedily to descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God. And he commends their hopes of happiest rest at the revelation of the Lord from heaven. How could it be possible, then, that their agitation of mind and perplexing trouble were the result of an apprehension that the Saviour was to come in their day? So far from being a source of disastrous disturbance, this was the gladdest and most consoling element of their faith and hope, so declared by the inspired apostle himself.

But this being "at hand," of which the apostle speaks, was something entirely different from the idea that the day of the Lord was only about to come. The original word is ενεστηκεν (from ενιστημι), and occurs seven times in the New Testament, but nowhere else in the sense of impending or near, in the relation of not yet quite arrived. In five out of the seven instances it is translated by the word "present," in the sense of already come. The phrase "at hand," is used in twenty other places in the New Testament, in the sense of near, though not yet quite arrived; but not in a single instance is the original ενεστηκεν, as here. Other versions are much truer to the meaning of this word. The Syriac, which is the oldest translation that was ever made, renders it by the phrase, is come. The Swiss version renders it the same, *est arrive*. MacKnight translates it, hath come. And the evidence is perfectly conclusive that such is the proper and only true significance of the

Digitized by Google

word. Luther renders it *vorhanden sei*, to be present, to exist at the time. Olshausen says it refers to "what is present." Bengel says "ενεστως means present." It does not mean something at hand, in the sense of being near, though not yet come, but something at hand in the sense of having already come—as being already present—without the possibility of any further waiting for it.

And the moment we take this true and only proper sense of the word, the complexion of the whole passage is entirely changed from the false interpretation which some have put upon it, and the precise nature of what was disturbing these Thessalonian believers becomes manifest. Somebody had been telling them that the day of the Lord had already come; that it was then present; that it had arrived, and was no longer a subject of hope or expectation. If what some were thus teaching them was true, they felt that a great misfortune had befallen them. They had been comforting themselves by the idea that, with the arrival of that day, their dead were to be restored to them; that their companions in the faith, who had fallen asleep, were to arise with the dawn of that day; and that they themselves were to be translated, and caught away to the clouds, to be for ever with the Lord, when that day should come. And if now it had already come, the conclusion was inevitable that they had been cherishing all these glad hopes in vain, and that all their joyous expectations had proved a cheat and a failure, for their dead had not been raised, and they were still left upon earth. Could it be that their faith was a mere deceit, and that all they had hoped from it was a mere delusion?

Such a doctrine, then, as that the day of the Lord had come, was a virtual subversion of their Christianity and their hope. It was well calculated to shake them from their mind as Christians, to confuse and confound all their ideas, and to fill them with utter despair. Hence, the interference of the apostle to counteract the misrepresentation, and restore their peace and comfort. He beseeches them, and conjures them most solemnly, by our gathering together unto the Lord Jesus, and as they valued their hopes, not to be so easily and quickly shaken in mind, not to be troubled by such sorrowful misgivings, and not for a moment to believe that the day of the Lord had come, or was then present in any such sense as to be no longer a subject of joyful anticipation, as it once had been. No matter in what way such a false idea might come to them, whether by apparent revelation from the Spirit, or by oral communication as if by apostolic authority, or even by letter, professing to come from under his own hand, he charges them by no means to believe it, and not for an instant to give place to the truthless assertion that the day of the Lord was not still pending, and still future.

No, no; not so unsubstantial and disappointing are the promises of Christianity. Not such an unreal thing is the doctrine of Christ's coming, the resurrection of the dead, and the gathering of the

Digitized by Google

saints in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. These things are literal realities. And whether from the Scriptures or from philosophy, men propose to explain them away, and to resolve them into mere poetry and gorgeous Oriental metaphor, it is the part of true Christian faith and obedience to refuse place to anything short of the literal and complete fulfilment of what the Saviour promised, and his inspired apostles so constantly preached. It was Hymeneus and Philetus who, in apostolic times, undertook to spiritualise and explain away the resurrection as past; but Paul says of them, that, concerning the truth, they erred; that they were overthrowers of the faith; and that their words were a corroding canker. (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18.) And he here says as much concerning all such as would spiritualise and explain away what else pertains to the literal promises and hopes touching Christ's coming, and the day of the Lord. None of these things are past, and none of them have yet transpired; and he who says they have, however he may explain it, is a heretic of a deadly sort, and no Christian can hold with him without ruin to his faith.

But this passage also shows the very different manner in which the early Christians must have conceived of the day of the Lord and the coming of Christ, from that which now obtains, in order to have been liable to such an erroneous impression on the subject. With the present popular conceptions of the sudden grandeur, conspicuity, and universal publicity of the coming of Christ, it would be utterly impossible to obtain currency for the idea that it was already present or accomplished. People now are looking for the world to come to an end,—for an utter break-up of the whole system of nature,—for a complete wreck of the universe. When we talk to them of the last day and the return of Christ, they begin to think of the burning up of all sublunary things, and of the complete extinction of human life, and even of the whole dwelling place of man and all created things. But if the early Christians had thought of this subject after this style, how is it possible that they could have believed the last day had come when the world still stood, and the stars remained in their places, and the whole course of nature was still going on as before? The thing is out of the question; they could not have entertained it for a single instant. But we have the inspired testimony that they did entertain it; and that they were so deeply and grievously swayed by it as to require the special interposition of the apostle to save them from despair on account of it. We argue, therefore, from these facts, that the primitive and proper ideas touching the coming of Christ and the day of the Lord were quite different from those which people now very generally entertain. The truth is that all this poetic nonsense of "the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds," is no part of Christianity, but a miserable and delusive interpolation of the faith. However great the changes from what now exists may be, when ultimately wrought out, it is abundantly set forth in the Scriptures

Digitized by Google

that there will be many stages in the process, and that no such summary and violent universal collapse shall ever occur as that of which poetry and superstition have dreamed. And when we come to look at what is predicted of these successive stages, and of the leading particulars which are to mark them, there is every reason to believe that most of them will occur while yet the world and the great mass of men are going on the same as now.

Take for example the arrival of the Saviour at those regions of the air whither his saints are to be gathered together unto him; what right have we to suppose that it will at once be visible and known to men in general? Has not the Lord's coming been repeatedly described as partaking of the nature of the coming of a thief? Has not he himself so described it, as well as his apostles? The time will be when he will manifest himself, and when every eye shall see him; but where is the evidence that it will be so at the beginning? And when we are told, over and over, that his first arrival will be in some stealthy and unrevealed manner, in which the world at large will know nothing of it, and not at all believe that such things are transpiring.

Some lay great stress on the declaration that the Lord is to "descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God," and argue with great confidence that this proves the openness and publicity of the Advent. But we do not at all perceive the force of such reasoning. A very important link is wanting to give it conclusiveness. It is nowhere said that this is to be a shout or voice which the world hears. The object of the shout and trumpet-call is to reach the saints, to awaken those that sleep in their graves, and to call both them and those alive away from the earth. There is not the slightest intimation that any one else will hear the call. When Christ arose and ascended, it is written that God went up "with a shout:" but who of earth's godless population heard it? Why, then, may he not come again with a shout, which shall be equally unheard by the common world? And even if there should be supernatural sounds, and sudden tumultuous demonstrations in earth and sky, that does not at all argue that they will be understood by people generally, or that the advent in its first stages, will be other than invisible. The men who journeyed with Paul, and were present when the Saviour personally appeared to him, heard a voice, and felt a mysterious commotion; but they saw nothing of the heavenly Speaker, and "heard not the voice of him that spake," much less comprehended the fact of the Divine presence.

Take, also, the matter of the resurrection of the sleeping saints, to which those Thessalonians were looking with so much holy comfort; and what proof is there that men generally will see or know anything about it when it occurs? The resurrected ones will know it, and those alive and remaining, who are to be caught up together with them, will know it, perhaps; but there is no in-

Digitized by Google

timation anywhere that it will be manifest to any one else. No one saw Christ rise; and no one saw those rise who rose with him; and the presumption is fair that his saints will also come from their graves quite as unobserved by the unbelieving multitudes, who will continue to go forward with their schemes and occupations as if nothing of the sort were transpiring.

And so in regard to the few waiting and ready ones among the living, who are then to be removed to the heavenly spaces. At least two men during the past ages have been thus removed. On the other side of the flood, "Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him." (Gen. v. 24.) Luther has the remark that "the original signifies that Enoch was lost, or disappeared, contrary to the thought or expectation of all the other patriarchs, and at once ceased to be among men. Enos, Seth, and all the other patriarchs, knew not by whom or whither he was taken away; they sought him, therefore, but found him not." This thing occurred without noise or display, and no one was able to tell anything about it. In after time Elijah also "went up by a whirlwind into heaven," without tasting of death. As a special favour, Elisha was permitted to witness it; but no one else saw it. Fifty men went out after him and sought three days, but found him not. Even the sons of the prophets could not be convinced for a time that he had gone as Elisha reported. They neither saw nor understood it, and much less was it manifest to the general community in which it occurred. And the wise man assures us that "the thing that hath been is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done." (Eccl. i. 9.) The Saviour's own account of the matter leaves the mind under the same impression. "I tell you, in that night there shall be two in one bed; the one taken and the other left. Two shall be grinding together [at the mill]; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left." (Luke xvii. 34-36.)

Now, with all this well agrees the liability of the Thessalonians to be deceived with the false idea that the day of the Lord had, perhaps, come without bringing them the fulfilment of their expectations; but it utterly confutes those wild and delirious pictures of the day of judgment which received their existence during the dark ages, and quite too much distort and render repulsive and alarming the sweet and precious doctrines of the faith in the common imagination. As Christians we have to learn the lesson of laying aside those distressing ideas of terror, and of looking forward to our Lord's coming, and all its relations to us, as only blessed, peaceful, and glad. It is not some great thunder-crash of destruction, laying the universe in sudden and instantaneous ruin, that we are to be expecting; but the gentle and loving call of our Lord, at which we shall evanish from the earth, rejoin our friends who sleep in Jesus, and take our everlasting places with our Saviour, where we will be hidden in the peaceful sky.

Digitized by Google

This case also furnishes an illustration of the real ground for alarm on the part of the unwatchful and unprepared, in view of the rapture of the saints. These Thessalonians were unfortunately led to think that the day of the Lord had come, and that they were left behind as having no part in the blessed gathering to the Lord in the air. The result was, that they were being driven to distraction. The very thought filled them with overwhelming anguish and dismay. And yet it was only an erroneous surmise—a mere peradventure, for which there was a bare possibility. But the hour is coming when what they but dimly imagined shall be sad reality to many. Though the unready and unsanctified may not see the dead arise, or the translated ones ascend, they will find it out afterwards. The truth in due time shall become manifest. And when the awful reality appears, that the day of the Lord is already come; that Jesus is present in the clouds; that the dead in Christ have been recalled from their tombs, and are with him in the heights; that the earnest, waiting, and watching ones, who have so mysteriously disappeared have gone with them like so many Enochs whom God hath translated; and that they are "left,"—left to take their portion with hypocrites and unbelievers—left to suffer the sorrows of the great tribulation, having lost their crowns and their part in the resurrection of the just:—alas! for the consternation and dismay which shall then take possession of them!

J. A. SEISS.

NOTES ON 2 TIMOTHY III., IV.

No. I.

STANDING as it were by the side of an open grave, ready to be offered up, and filled with that testimony of Jesus which is the spirit of prophecy, Paul the aged writes a last brief letter, primarily to his dearly beloved son Timothy, and through him to all who have ears to hear, in which epistle we find the weighty declaration, "This know, that in the last days grievous times shall present themselves" (ἐνστήσονται).

Ere further considering the meaning of the expression "the last days," I am enabled by the kindness of Mr. J. W. Bosanquet, F.R.A.S., Treasurer of the Society of Biblical Archæology, to lay before the readers of the RAINBOW a brief chronology of the Bible, extracted from a fuller one compiled by him. Mr. Bosanquet's labours in this very difficult field are well known to all scientific students of the subject; and his chronological articles in the learned Transactions of the Society are remarkable alike for great ability and research and for a most reverent and loving spirit towards the Bible,—a frame of mind from which it must be feared the greater portion of the lettered intellect of the age is now estranged. To give an illustration of variety of opinion in chronology: we

Digitized by Google

find after comparing the systems of Usher, Creswell, Horne, Hales, the Rev, D. H. Haigh (an Assyrian scholar), Prof. Brandes (a German Assyriologist), Mr. Samuel Sharpe, the late lamented George Smith, and Mr. Bosanquet, that the date of a comparatively late event—the accession of Rehoboam—is variously placed from B.C. 990 to 936. I must refer those who would further investigate Mr. Bosanquet's system to his works, and more especially to his researches into that exceedingly intricate portion of history treated of in the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel. Vide paper on "The Date of the Fall of Nineveh and the Beginning of the Reign of Nebuchadnezzar." (Trans. Soc. Bib. Archæol. ii., 147-148.) Also paper on the "Synchronous History of certain Kings of Assyria and Judah." (Ibid. iii. 1-82.)

I.—Chronology of the Bible.

ANNO MUNDI.		B.C.
	Creation of Man (Assyrian, *Admu*; Hebrew, *Adam*) .	4035
1656	The Flood	2379
2008	Birth of Abraham	2027
2073*	Call of Abraham, 70 Weeks before the giving of the Law (Acts vii. 2-5)	1962
2108	Birth of Isaac	1927
2133	Offering of Isaac, æt. 25; Covenant with Abraham (Gen. xxii. 18)	1902
2563	The Giving of the Law, 430 years after the Covenant (Gal. iii. 17)	1472
3053	Dedication of the Temple by Solomon, 70 Weeks before the building of the Second Temple . . .	982
3543	The Second Temple founded (Haggai. ii. 10-15) . .	492
4033*	Birth of Christ, 70 Weeks after the taking of the Kingdom by Darius (Dan. ix. 1, 2, 24) . . .	8-2
4035 (1965)	Beginning of the Christian Era	0
6000 A.M.	. . . = . . .	A.D. 1965

* Note on the Cycle of the Jubilee.

2073 — 2563
2563 — 3353
3053 — 3543
3543 — 4033

} = 49 ✖ 10 = 490 years.

II.—The Cycle of the Jubilee from the Dedication of the Second Temple.

	B.C.
Second Temple dedicated in the sixth year of Darius, in association with the Xerxes (Ezra iii. 14, 15) . .	486
	A.D.
70 Weeks (i.e., sevens) end in	5
70 × 7 = 490 = 49 × 10 end in	495
490 years end in	985
490 years end in	1475
490 years end in	1965

or *Anno Mundi* 6000.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Bosanquet also notices that from A.D. 630, when Mahomet formally set up his religion for the world at large (vide Muir, Life of Mahomet, iv. 168), and commenced his career of violence by the persecution of Arabian Jews, to A.D. 1965 is 1335 "days." (Cf. Dan. xii. 12.) The original does not necessarily imply periods of twenty-four hours, but more generally "periods" whose length might, in the abstract, correspond with that of either days or years.

The ancient belief that the Mosaic Days of Creation were intended to adumbrate ages in the world's history, and that six working periods of one thousand years were to be crowned by the Divine Sabbatismos (Heb. iv. 9; cf. 2 Pet. iii. 8; Apoc. xx. 4), is doubtless familiar to the readers of the RAINBOW, and certainly seems to be in perfect accordance with the comments of St Paul on Gen. ii. 2. In the Epistle of Barnabas this view is asserted absolutely: "Consider what that signifies, he finished them in six days. The meaning of it is this: with him, one day is a thousand years. Therefore, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, shall all things [relating to the present dispensation] be accomplished. And what is that he saith, And he rested the seventh day. He meaneth this: that when his Son shall come and abolish the season of the Wicked One, and judge the ungodly; then he shall gloriously rest on that seventh day." (Barnabas xiii. 4, 6.) To quote also the beautiful words of Augustine at the close of his great work: "Certainly that city [the New Jerusalem] shall have no greater joy than the celebration of the grace of Christ, who redeemed us by his blood. There shall be accomplished the words of the Psalm, 'Be still, and know that I am God.' There shall be the great Sabbath, which God celebrated amongst his first works, as it is written. We shall ourselves be the seventh day [i.e., its glories personified]. We shall have eternal leisure to see that he is God, for we shall be full of him when he shall be all in all. This Sabbath shall appear still more clearly if we count the ages as days, in accordance with the periods of time defined in Scripture, for that period will be found to be the seventh." (De Civitate Dei, xxii. 30.)

The foregoing chronological considerations are worthy of attentive examination in any endeavour to consider the present position in time of the Church of Christ; and as the apostle in the passage before us undoubtedly refers to the last days of the present dispensation,—the period of the proclamation of the good news by human agency unaccompanied by supernatural displays, the period during which the church is being slowly gathered out of the world, the age of faith as opposed to that of sight,—they may aid us in arriving at some conclusion whether we are now living in the last days, or upon the verge of them, or not.

Let us next proceed to an analysis of the phrase "in the last days" (*ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*); and here, as will speedily be observed, considerable caution is required. The expression is not the equivalent of the "after times" (*ὑστέροις καιροῖς*) of 1 Tim. iv. 1.

Digitized by Google

The "last days" are the closing portion of the "after times." It is altogether distinct from the period mentioned in Heb. i. 2, the exact meaning of which passage is somewhat lost in the Authorised Version. The statement of the Apostle there is, "God having spoken to the fathers by the [Hebrew] prophets, at the end of these [i.e., the prophetical] days (ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) has spoken to us by his Son;" or, as we read elsewhere, "The prophets were *until* John." The expression, "In the last days," is however used by St. Peter in his sermon on the Day of Pentecost when quoting the prophecy of Joel respecting the signs and wonders which would immediately precede "the day of Yahveh" (Joel ii. 28-32), or Jehovah, a prophecy which is applied by the apostle as adumbrating the extraordinary events accompanying the First Advent, although not to be fulfilled exhaustively until the Second. In the last days therefore, not only will people speak under Divine inspiration (not *predict*) as at Pentecost, but the ordinary course of things, these "laws of nature," about which we now hear so much, and the regularity of whose action supplies the mocker of prophecy with no small portion of his gibes (cf. 2 Pet. iii. 4), will be invaded by portentous alterations. (Matt. xxiv. 29; Acts ii. 19, 20.) Again, we find another expression in 1 Pet. i. 20, where we read that Christ was manifested "at the latter time" (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων equivalent to ἐπ' εσχατου τον χρόνου), i.e., of the then history of the world; just as at present 1877 is the last year of the world's history. The same Apostle tells us that Christ's people are preserved "through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1 Pet. i. 5). Of this "last time," when salvation is ready to be revealed by the Second Advent of the Saviour, the "last days" form a portion. In this "last time" (ἐσχάτῳ χρονῳ, Jude 18, χρονῳ = καιρῷ) shall be the "mockers" (ἐμπαῖκται), translated "scoffers" in 2 Pet. iii. 3, who ridicule the doctrine of the Second Advent; both apostles use the same word. These mockers act ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν = ἐν εσχαταις ἡμέραις, "in the last days," in which also wealth ill-acquired shall be marvellously accumulated. (Jas. v. 3.) R. BROWN, JUN., F.A.S.

(To be continued.)

PRAISE.

"Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me."—PSA. l. 23.

WE offer praise to thee, O God,
For what thyself thou art;
All perfect in thine attributes,
All loving in thy heart!

We praise thee for thy mighty works,
Which gloriously proclaim
Thy power and wisdom absolute,
Thine everlasting fame!

Digitized by Google

We praise thee for thy word of light
That shines upon our way,
Whilst, through the pilgrimage of faith,
We seek the perfect day.

We praise thee for thy priceless gift,
Thy Christ, the loving Lord,
Who came to do thy loving will,
In thought, and deed, and word.

We praise thee for the plan profound
That chose him as our Head,
That gives us life in him who rose
In triumph from the dead!

O God most wonderful! thy praise
We sing with grateful tongue;
And in the resurrection joy
We shall resume the song.

THE REJECTION OF CHRIST.

WHAT was the *real* cause of the rejection of Christ by the Jews as a nation, and how was it that they were so blind to the truth? After a seventy years' captivity they had returned to the land of their fathers, and their long exile had burned into their souls, as it were, one great and glorious lesson,—hatred of idolatry; at least outward idolatry. One is the more struck, therefore, with the fact of their rejection of the Messiah, and at first quite puzzled to know why their rigid adherence to their Law, was so unproductive of good results. I can only come to the conclusion that though the seventy years' captivity had driven out the demon of *external* idolatry it had been quite ineffectual in expelling the *internal* idolatry of the heart. For the accomplishment of the former seventy years had sufficed; for the eradication of the latter two thousand have not as yet been enough. This is, to my mind, a clear proof that the great controversy which God has with his creatures is necessarily a long process, because it is the heart that has to be touched. Now with respect to the Jews I think our Lord's words were perfectly true. "The last state of that man is worse than the first."

In Milman's *History of the Jews* we find the following very remarkable and very able statement: "This was but one indication of that singular alteration in the national character of the Jews which displayed itself after their return from the captivity. The loss of that which had been the life of the religion, the temple service, with its offerings and processions and music, may have acted more powerfully even than the service itself, on multitudes who felt the

Digitized by Google

dreary vacancy, the insupportable want of their accustomed excitement. . . . Prone, the mass of them, all but the wiser and more enlightened who worshipped Jehovah, to worship him but as a national God, greater and mightier than the gods of other nations, (a conception in itself polytheistic,) they threw aside this lower kind of pride, to assume that of the sole people of the one true God. . . . The observance of the Sabbath, and even of the Sabbatical year, was enforced with a rigour of which we have no precedent in the earlier annals. In short, from this period commences that unsocial spirit, that hatred towards mankind and want of humanity to all but their own kindred, with which, notwithstanding the extent to which they carried proselytism to their religion, the Jews are branded by all the Roman writers." Their rigorous exclusiveness had in fact, instead of placing them in moral superiority *above* their neighbours, placed them in fierce *antagonism* to them, and thus, instead of becoming--what God had meant them to be--*lights* of the world, they refused to show their light at all. In other words, their *pride* was as great as ever, and was even increased by their subject condition.

It has been truly said that "our pride is often increased by the retrenchments we make from our other failings," and so it seems was the case with the Jews on their return from Babylon. They strove to indemnify themselves for their humiliating position by the stern and haughty manner in which they excluded all the nations from any participation in their religious privileges.

In point of fact it would seem that they wished by extreme attention to ceremonials to gain admission into the kingdom of God, and thought that *because* they were children of Abraham after the flesh, *therefore* all the promises belonged to them. They had no doubt much in their Scriptures, if taken literally, to justify them in thinking so. They had the promises to Abraham and his seed, they had the presence of God not unfrequently manifested among them, and above all they and they alone were entrusted with "the oracles of God." It is perfectly clear that as time went on they became more and more convinced that they were especial favourites of God. That this was their grand delusion is very evident from the fact, among others, of John the Baptist telling those who came to him, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham for our father, for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." In his controversies with the rulers of the Jews and the Pharisees our Lord has constantly to remind them that the claim to be children of Abraham after the flesh would not avail them anything unless they also did the deeds of Abraham. The whole stress of St. Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Romans turns on the fact that Israel after the flesh had no right to expect to be called God's children unless they showed in their lives that the Spirit of God really ruled in their hearts. The references in St. James's Epistle also, to those who

Digitized by Google

seemed to be, and doubtless were in their own eyes religious, suffice to prove that even in those days men had a form of religion while denying the power thereof. Now of all things this is perhaps spiritually the most dangerous. The prophets have over and over again to assure the people that God was greatly displeased with them for "drawing near to him with their lips," and even for devoutly and attentively listening to his words without obeying them. "Thine habitation is in the midst of deceit, through deceit they refuse to know me, saith the Lord." "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these." "Also, thou son of man, the children of thy people still are talking against thee, . . . and speak one to another, every one to his brother, saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord. And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they will not do them." (Ezek. xxxiii. 30.) St. James also tells us that "to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin;" and in fact the burden of all the prophets and apostles is that knowledge of truth is of no use, *per se*, unless it leads to action. It has been well said, "To know the truth without obeying it is the surest way to make a man *devilish*. "Knowledge puffs up" when not joined with the worship of the heart; and it was thus I presume that the Jews of our Lord's time, or at least the leaders of the Jews had become so blinded. They had become *exclusive* and consequently prejudiced and unfair. They boasted, as St. Paul tells us, that they were "guides of the blind, and lights of them who were in darkness," and to such an extent had this gone that their first question in relation to any point was, "Have any of the rulers or Pharisees believed it?—for this people who know not the law are cursed."

We should always bear in mind the unquestioned fact that it was not the masses of the people who rejected the Messiah but rather *the professing religious world of Judæa*. Strange as it may appear it is too often the case, as has been frequently remarked, that professedly religious people are the *weakest* of men. No doubt many blessed exceptions must be made to this statement, but speaking generally there is too much reason to believe it is a fact. This *weakness* has been as a matter of history too often taken advantage of by the *strength* of others, and has thus been the cause of Christianity, instead of presenting to the world the fair and lovely features of the Bride of Christ, having been but a ghastly mockery and caricature.

Throughout the long night of the middle ages, and even far before that time, yea, almost from the end of the first century, what was called *religion* has been in reality nothing more than a superstition,—a superstition so abject that we read of processions of popes, cardinals, and princes going out in solemn state followed by

Digitized by Google

a numerous crowd of votaries to meet and receive with honours the bones of some dead man.

The cause of all this seems to have been the petrifying effect of theology, so-called, upon the mind; or rather, to call things by their right names, the increase of carnal pride, caused by the study of this pseudo-science, and which when probed to the bottom is found to arise from an idea that God cares for us more than he does for others. It is in fact the old and melancholy deceit so truly exposed by our Lord, which finds utterance, often no doubt unconsciously, in the words: "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are." *This*, and this above all, is the grand weakness of the heart, and it is that upon which our great enemy always fixes, and too often with fatal effect.

In the parable of the unclean spirit, our Lord shows how it was that the Jews had become what they were. After a long course of constant and repeated idolatries they had been carried captive to Babylon, and then the unclean spirit of external idolatry had gone out of them; but unhappily it was only to be replaced by "seven other spirits more wicked than the first," who entered in and dwelt there. The unclean spirit of external idolatry was succeeded by the worse idolatry of selfishness and pride, an idolatry which has in it all the elements of external idolatry, coupled with other vices of a more deadly character. The *climax* of this evil was shown in the rejection of the Lord, and ultimately in such fearful institutions as the Inquisition; for we must remember that it was in reality the same spirit of wickedness carried over as it were into the Christian Church, that was then permitted to show itself in its true colours. And this spirit has the closest affinity with the delusion that God is not the Saviour of all men, and that he only cares for a few. In other words its essence is *spiritual pride*, which culminates in the two most odious of vices, *hypocrisy* and *envy*. Pilate, we are told, knew that through envy the Jews had delivered our Lord into his hands, and we know how frequent and even incessant were the Saviour's own denunciations against the hypocrisy of the Jewish rulers, or rather the Jewish *spiritual rulers*. We may, however, I trust be permitted to hope that the rejection of our Lord was owing mainly to the conduct and sin of a few, and that both the masses of the people and the majority of the rulers sinned quite as much in ignorance as in presumption. We have abundant reason for supposing that many of them had a zeal for God, though that zeal was without knowledge. So long as real sincerity and earnestness are present there must be many redeeming points in human character. It is only the "servant who knew his Lord's will and doeth it not" that "shall be beaten with many stripes." We may be quite certain that the Searcher of all hearts will make every right allowance for those who sin through mere ignorance.

That this was so in the case of the Jewish people we may conclude from the instance of St. Paul, for we have every reason to

Digitized by Google

believe that there were many like him, sincere and zealous after their lights, and who therefore will like him "obtain mercy because they did it ignorantly in unbelief." The case of St. Paul, in connection with the rejection of Christianity, is most important and instructive. It at once raises the very interesting question, Wherein consisted St. Paul's sin? He tells us that he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel; that he had profited in the Jews' religion above many of his equals, and that he really and sincerely thought he ought to do many things contrary to the doctrine of Christ. He no doubt looked up to the Pharisees and doctors of the law as his spiritual guides, and obeyed those "who sat in Moses' seat" as a zealous Jew. Much might therefore be said for him, and yet we find him lamenting to his dying day his cruelties towards Christians. What makes his case so interesting is that he no doubt represents a *class*, and by no means a small one, who are to be found now as in every age, namely, those who follow blindly and unintelligently those whom they regard as their religious teachers, instead of attending to our Lord's command to call no man "father" upon earth, for that we have but one Father,—even God. The truth is that we have no right to evade our own responsibility by casting it upon others, and indeed to do so is to abrogate our title to being children of God. The child everywhere and always should trust and obey, not his brother but his father. Through Christ "we *all* have access by one Spirit unto the Father," and should, therefore, while listening attentively to all that our fellow Christians urge, allow that blessed Spirit, and him alone, to be our guide. The not doing this was in reality St. Paul's error. He put the Pharisees and scribes in the place of the Spirit of God, and consequently "the blind leading the blind, both fell into the ditch."

Now if so zealous and devoted a man as St. Paul could make such a mistake, ought it not to be a lesson to all of us at the present day to be careful how we allow either spiritual pride or prejudice to lead us to judge one another? More especially should we be careful not to let theology—so-called—blind our eyes or suffer us to believe that God is not the Father of all who diligently seek Him. Let us each and all take heed to the Apostle's words: "Judge nothing before the time; but judge this rather that no man place a stumbling block or occasion of falling in his brother's way." We should remember that all men without exception are the creation of our Father in heaven, and that it is not for us to consider ourselves better than others. We may truly say with St. Paul: "What hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou receivedst it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?"—therefore "be not high-minded but fear." * T. W.

Digitized by Google

DEATH THE ENTIRE EXTINCTION OF LIFE.

I WAS much pleased with the candid remarks of Mr. J. J. Hobbs in the March RAINBOW, headed, "The Secondary Question." And the question he asks, "What is the general teaching of the Bible on man's nature?" is important. It was chiefly from the general teaching of the Bible, and a few emphatic passages, that I became satisfied that when a man dies he is *dead*, and not alive somewhere else. That there are passages which seem to countenance the idea of soul or spirit life after death is not denied; but what doctrine has ever been taught in favour of which some passages may not be quoted? But our understanding of such passages will depend upon the standpoint from which we view them. Hence the necessity of endeavouring to view each passage from the standpoint of the writer; and hence also the wisdom of explaining figures, metaphors, and obscure passages by others that are plain, distinct, and unquestionable, which treat upon the same subject. In this way that which is clear sheds light upon the obscure; difficulties vanish; and apparent contradictions are reconciled. Who that has studied Scripture cannot look back to the time when many passages seemed obscure and inexplicable, and in regard to which the mind may have hung in suspense, perhaps for years; and when at last a ray from some other passage has shed its light over them, it has become matter of wonder that they were not clearly understood at the first? In our apprehensions we differ, but the voice of Scripture is one. In it there is not "yea and nay;" and those in the honest pursuit of truth will prefer to keep the mind in suspense rather than accept a solution of difficult passages which is at variance with the general tenor of Divine teaching.

With all respect to Mr. Hayward, I think that, in his pleading for "soul-life in death," he has not only failed to show that I have used Scripture inappropriately, but that he has grouped together passages that have no bearing upon the subject. Just take the six passages heading his paper in March. "We shall not die." (Hab. i. 12.) Israel had been threatened with destruction by the Chaldeans. The prophet's plea was that the Chaldeans were "more wicked" than Israel, and that it would be unrighteous to allow the wicked to devour those who were more righteous then themselves. Hence he pleads, "O Lord my God, mine Holy One, we shall not die." "Not die" by the Chaldeans, is meant, and not that they should never die. "Our Saviour, Jesus Christ, . . . abolished death." (2 Tim. i. 10.) Is it contended that the time has come when "there shall be no more death?" that "death, the last enemy is destroyed?" that "death and hades are cast into the lake of fire?" We can scarcely think this; but if not, why quote the passage? "The Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die." (2 Sam. xii. 13.) This cannot mean more than that David should

Digitized by Google

not *then die*, although he had sinned in slaying Uriah by the sword of the Ammonites, and then taking his wife: for afterward we read "Now the days of David drew nigh that he *should die*." (1 Kings ii. 1.) And a thousand years afterward, Peter, whose words are not to be questioned, affirmed that he was still dead. (Acts ii. 29.) "The Lord hath chastened me sore: but he hath not given me over unto death." (Psa. cxviii. 18.) This Psalm reveals the Psalmist, while "compassed about with his enemies like bees," "calling upon the Lord in his distress," and the Lord delivered his "soul from death," as in Psa. lvi. 13 and cxvi. 8, next quoted: "Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling." Thus we cannot see that any one passage of the whole group has the least bearing upon the question of "soul life in death:" and certainly those from the Psalms do not reveal the psalmist as cherishing any expectations that even had he been "delivered over unto death" his soul would still have been "preserved in life," but rather the contrary.

None of the passages heading my paper in September have been shown to be irrelevant. "An after-death judgment" surely does *not* "point, as clearly as can be, to continuity of life," but to being "raised again to life"—a doctrine plainly taught throughout Scripture. And, no "hint of *resurrection*" being in this passage, is surely no evidence that resurrection does not take place before judgment! And being "redeemed out of death and corruption," is exactly that for which we contend. But we wonder what there is of man to "redeem from corruption" according to Mr. Hayward. It cannot surely be the "soul-spirit" man who is "preserved through death in a life of happiness;" nor the cast off body which is not to be restored.

Little or nothing can be learned regarding man's death-state from 2 Cor. xii. 2-4. Paul heard "unspeakable words which it is not lawful"—"not *possible*," according to Young and others,—"for a man to utter." And what state he was in while receiving these "visions and revelations," he could not tell, Such being the case, there is little chance that any one else will be able to tell. The only one Paul refers to as knowing, is God: "God knoweth." Others, however, besides Paul had "visions and revelations." Ezekiel, when in captivity, was brought "in the visions of God into the land of Israel and set upon a very high mountain." (Ezek. xl. 1-4.) The purpose of this vision was to see, and hear, and declare to Israel what should afterward be. John, when in Patmos, was called up into heaven, and he says that he "was in the spirit." (Rev. iv. 1-2.) And again that he was "carried away in the spirit into the wilderness." (Rev. xvii. 1-3.) But what advantage can be gained by speculations about the state Ezekiel was in when "brought in the visions of God into the land of Israel," or Paul when receiving "visions and revelations of God;" or John "in the spirit?" Or what proof can be gained from such sources for man

Digitized by Google

being "preserved in life through death?" But still the question recurs; why should Paul use such phraseology as "whether in body or out of body, I cannot tell," unless he believed in man being "preserved in life" independent of bodily organism? Now there *may* have been a reason, although it should not appear, and although we should be ignorant of it. Some in Corinth denied "the resurrection of the dead." "How," asks Paul, "say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" (1 Cor. xv. 12.) What then? Did those who denied resurrection cherish *no hope* of after life? We cannot conceive of this. Clearly we think they must have adopted the "soul-life" theory; the Gnostic doctrine of soul-life apart from a body for ever. Paul's language we regard as a total denial of any ground for hope of such soul-life. "If the dead rise not," he says, "then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, and they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" (ver. 17). Now in the event of "no resurrection" what had "perished?" The body merely? Was it the body only that had "fallen asleep in Christ?" while the soul, "the real personal self," as Mr. Hayward affirms, "lives in conscious happiness," alike independent of body and independent of resurrection? If "Jesus truly died," and "the same Jesus, when dead, resuscitated his erst mortal frame,—requickened his own body," * why should they that have "fallen asleep in Christ perish" as the result of no resurrection? Instead of teaching that "Christ, when truly dead, requickened his own body," and that the dead in Christ are "preserved in life through death," Paul's testimony is, "If Christ be not risen, we are false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that HE raised up Christ," and that "all in Christ shall be *made alive* at his coming" (vers. 14-23). I confess that teachings more opposed I cannot well conceive of. But when Paul speaks of being caught away into paradise and receiving visions and revelations of God, the non-resurrectionists in Corinth would be ready to seize upon the statement as a triumph to their cause. "Why, Paul," they would be ready to say, "you could not be caught away bodily into Paradise, it must have been only the soul: and if the soul can be thus caught away, and, bodiless, receive 'visions and revelation,' what may hinder it to enjoy life when the body is dead, and hence what need of resurrection of body at all?" Anticipating such an argument by the non-resurrectionists in Corinth, and possibly having heard it before, was, we feel persuaded, the reason why Paul used such language. At all events *he* does not adopt the life-in-death theory as a solution of the philosophical difficulty.

It may frankly be admitted that chap. v. 1-10 of this epistle, looks like countenancing the idea of life for man apart from the

* That I am not misrepresenting Mr. Hayward, but using his very words, see pp. 183-4 of April RAINBOW.

Digitized by Google

body. Indeed, it has been regarded as one of the strongest proofs for soul-life in death. In the RAINBOW for March and April Mr. Hayward has devoted about four pages to it, and very justly observes that "this whole passage, 2 Cor. iv. 16 to v. 10, deserves our careful consideration." We would, however, suggest the whole passage from chap. iii. 1 to v. 10 as essential to a clear apprehension of the apostle's meaning, and would trust to the reader's acquaintance with the contextual connections while offering a few thoughts on the subject.

Leaving out the supplementary word *this* in chap. v. 1-4 the passage reads, "For we know that if our earthly house of tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in tabernacle do groan, being burdened, not for that we would be unclothed but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

It seems beyond question that the apostle here contrasts the present mortal body with the immortal body of resurrection; but the context and the language suggest that there is more compared and contrasted than merely the present and the future body. In the last verse of chap. iv. the apostle says, "we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal: but the things which are not seen are eternal." "Things spiritual" form no contrast to "things temporal," although often so used; the true contrast to things temporal (temporary) is given by the apostle,—"things eternal." And among "the things not seen and eternal" of chap. iv. 18, which "we look at (walking by faith, not by sight)," must be "the building of God, the house not made with hands" of chap. v. 1, whatever that "building" may be. But are we necessarily shut up to the conclusion that "our earthly house of tabernacle" is the mortal body? or that "the building of God, the house not made with hands eternal in the heavens," is the immortal body of resurrection? Let us distinguish between what is said by the apostle, and what may be *supposed* to be his meaning. And although "bodiless souls" and "naked spirits" are expressions frequently found in theology, they have no place in apostolic writings. There is neither *soul* nor *spirit*, belonging to man, mentioned in this passage; and the apostle gives no explanation as to what is meant by his metaphors. Hence if, in our application of them, we make a mistake, all our arguments and conclusions built upon that mistake must fall to the ground. Now, if death be here figured by "our earthly house of tabernacle being dissolved;" and if "this mortal putting on immortality" be figured by our "having a building of God, an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens," the language is wholly exceptional. For where shall we

Digitized by Google

find a parallel passage? And besides, although we do not expect a figure to agree in every point with the thing signified, yet in this application we fail to find a contrast where we naturally expect the contrast to be striking. In the case of one body being dissolved, and the other of eternal duration, the contrast is apparent, but what is there in the mortal body to contrast with the immortal body in its being "*not* made with hands"? And this being a particular point there must surely be something as its contrast.

Again, viewing man in his entirety as a "tripartite being," as he is called, he may, in figure, be spoken of as "dissolved" when his spirit is withdrawn, when his life departs, and "the dust returns to the dust as it was;" but viewing "our earthly house of tabernacle," *not* as the man, but only the body as a tent or tabernacle in which the man, the soul, has resided for a time, but has cast off or left at death, as a man would "cast off his coat, or leave a falling house,"—in this view "the earthly house,"—the body, is not surely necessarily "*dissolved*" at death. The dissolution of the body may follow as the result of death; but death and the dissolution of the body are not surely necessarily identical.

Mr. Hayward has it that, "Adequately to represent the thought which filled his mind is probably the occasion of the apostle's use of the mixed metaphor of the tent and the vesture to figure his material earthly body." To find the reason of the "mixed metaphor being employed," however, we must rather look to the materials which supplied the apostle with his imagery. And for this purpose we must take a survey of Hebrew life and history. We must join him in chap. iii. and ascend to the summit of Mount Sinai, and see the "pattern of the tabernacle" shown to Moses;—look on while it is being reared up in the wilderness; and see Moses "spread abroad the *tent over the tabernacle*, and put the covering of the tent above upon it," (Exod. xl. 19,) where we find the apostle supplied with his varied "mixture of metaphor." Thus we find the tabernacle proper had its house or tent, with covering, clothing, or vesture of "rams' skins and badgers' skins dyed red," necessary for its protection, and suitable for its removals in the wilderness journeyings of Israel. But after Israel had reached their destined place of "settled abode," and the building of the temple by Solomon completed; then we find an additional supply of metaphor for the apostle, when the "temporal" (or temporary) tent-house of the tabernacle, with its weather "clothing," was "dissolved;" and the tabernacle taken into its more enduring "building." "A house made with hands," no doubt, but still a house, incomparably more enduring than its house of curtains in the wilderness, although infinitely *less* enduring than the "building of God"—the "house not made with hands eternal in the heavens," contemplated by the apostle. And as the law, "having a shadow of good things to come," though "not the very image of the things,"—as the apostle tells us—furnished much of the

Digitized by Google

imagery afterwards found in the Psalms and the prophets; so, much of the imagery found in the apostles has its foundation in both the "law and the prophets." Thus in Isa. xl. 22 we read, "He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." And in Psa. cii. 25, "Of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment: as a vesture shalt thou change them." And again, "In them he set a tabernacle for the sun." Here, then, we have Paul's idea of "our earthly house of tabernacle" corresponding with the temporary curtain-house of the tabernacle in the wilderness. And Paul being "an Hebrew of the Hebrews,"—familiar with the law in its every detail,—and with all things "written in the prophets;"—and as his "manner was" to "reason out of the Scriptures;"—it is but natural that he should use the figures and phraseology of his own nation, found in these Scriptures. Now, in these passages, we have "tent" and "tabernacle," "garment," "vesture," "curtain"—all the figures and phraseology of 2 Cor. v., and yet, in not one case used to "figure the material earthly body." And not only so; but we have also the "*dissolving*"—"the passing away"—of the things thus figured, to be succeeded by "the things which are not seen," but which are enduring, "eternal." "The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is *clean dissolved*, and shall be removed like a cottage." (Isa. xxiv. 19-20.) This is immediately followed by the "Lord reigning on Mount Zion,"—"death swallowed up of victory," (mortality swallowed up of life, 2 Cor. v. 4,) and "tears wiped from off all faces." (Isa. xxiv. 23, and xxv. 8.) And again, "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind," but "the new heavens and the new earth which I will create shall *remain* before me saith the Lord." (Isa. lxv. 17, and lxvi. 22.) And Peter says, "The heavens being on fire shall be *dissolved*, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing, then, that *all these things shall be dissolved*." (2 Peter iii. 10.) "But we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness"—a dwelling place for the righteous.

Now, we think it clear that "the things seen and temporal—our earthly house to be dissolved"—spoken of by Paul, are the same as "all these things that shall be dissolved," of which Peter speaks. Indeed, Peter tells us that, "according to the wisdom given unto him, Paul had in all his epistles spoken of *these things*" (vers. 15, 16). If then, "our earthly house of tabernacle," be not used by Paul to figure "our mortal body," but the place of abode in our present mortal state, it follows that neither is "an house not made with hands," used to figure the "immortal body of resurrection,"

Digitized by Google

but the place of abode prepared for the glorified saints. And for this there is ample corroborative evidence. Thus spake God unto David concerning his "promised seed," "I will be his Father, and I will settle him in mine *house* and in my kingdom for ever." And David, who was taken from the "sheep-cote" to be king over Israel, in that transcendently beautiful Psalm, the twenty-third, in language evidently suggested by a shepherd's experience in leading his sheep through a deep dark valley under the shadow of a great mountain, and the danger of a sheep being lost, expresses himself as "fearing no evil," though he "should walk through the valley of the shadow of death," and thus be concealed for a time in the tomb—"the land of darkness and shadow of death"—being confident that he would "awake in his Lord's likeness," he says, "And I will dwell in the *house* of the Lord for ever." How finely our Lord's words agree with these sentiments. "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." "And the servant abideth not in the *house* for ever, but the Son abideth ever."

When the Lord had given David rest round about in the land which he had given Israel as their own, and David sat in his house of cedars he expressed regret that the "ark of God" still remained in its house of curtains and purposed to "build for it a house." But it was not desirable that it should be "unclothed," or divested of its curtain-covering till a more enduring building was ready. In like manner the apostle, while "earnestly desiring to be clothed upon," and to be "at home with the Lord" in the "house eternal," yet he had no desire to be "unclothed," but would rather that the Lord, who had gone away "to prepare a place," should return to receive him that so he might "ever be with the Lord."

It is also worthy of remark that, in the passages referred to, the surpassing excellence of the "good things to come," as compared with the things of the present or the past, is ascribed rather to the "eternal" duration of "the things to come," than to their superlative degree of excellency. And, moreover, whatever variety of phrase, figure, or metaphor may be employed, there are only three states or conditions contemplated by the apostle as possible for the saints. And bearing in mind the sources from which he derives his imagery there will be little difficulty in deciding to which of the three the different metaphors apply. Chief stress being laid on verses 6-10, and as part of Alford's rendering, and also his exposition are given, we quote the paragraph:—"Being then always confident, and knowing that, whilst we are in our home in the body, we are away from our home in the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by appearance), we are still confident, and well content rather to go from our home in the body, and to come to our home with the Lord. Wherefore also it is our aim that whether present or absent, we may be

Digitized by Google

well pleasing unto him. For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things [done] in the body according to the things that he did, whether it were good or bad." Young has it:—"Having courage, then, at all times and knowing that being at home in the body, we are away from home from the Lord, (for through faith we walk, not through sight,) we have courage, and are well pleased rather to be away from the home of the body, and to be at home with the Lord. Wherefore also we aim, whether at home or away from home, to be well-pleasing to him."

Commenting on this passage, Mr. Hayward has some curious statements. On p. 182 of April RAINBOW, he says, "The contrast plainly is not of absence from one body and presence with another, of going out from home in a carnal body to enter a new home in a spiritual body; but it lies in quitting the earthly body to be present—not, as appears, in a body at all—with the Lord." Yet, in the very next paragraph he says, "His" (Paul's) "confidence was to be found of the Lord, though it might be out of the body at his coming." Now, how could Paul possibly expect "to be *found* of the Lord, though it might be out of the body at his coming;" and at the same time expect to be *present* with the Lord, "out of the body," from the very moment of his death, during the whole period till his coming? Should I be absent from home and leave my family behind, I may expect to find them on my return, but should my family join me in my absence and remain with me till my return, I cannot expect to find them on my return! Paul clearly contemplates himself and the saints in Corinth, while bearing "the image of the earthy" as "at home" in their "earthly house of tabernacle" and not until they bear the "image of the heavenly," at "home" in their "house which is from heaven;" but while contemplating but two "homes," he contemplates three possible states or conditions. We say three *possible* states or conditions, because, while all the faithful are partakers of the first and third, all will not have part in the second. Paul had no desire to have part in the second.

In the first: in "our earthly house;" "at home," "clothed;" "in this we groan, being burdened." "All groan," "even we who have the firstfruits of the Spirit do groan." (Rom. viii. 23.)

In the second: "unclothed," "absent," "away from home," "cut off out of the land of the living," having neither dwelling place, house, nor home among men, in "our earthly house," nor yet "present with the Lord," or "at home," in the "house eternal." A condition not to be desired! "Not that we would be unclothed," says Paul. No! he preferred to "groan under the burden" of the present, to being in the unclothed state. And this agrees with our Lord's prayer for his disciples, "Father, I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world." (John xviii. 15.)

In the third: "clothed," "present with the Lord," "at home

Digitized by Google

in our house which is from heaven," "mortality swallowed up of life." Earnestly to be desired, "earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven."

Now, let it be distinctly noted, that in this passage we have a being "clothed," "present," "at home" in "our earthly house," and a being "clothed," "present," "at home," "with the Lord," in "our house which is from heaven;" but between these there is a being "unclothed," "naked," "absent," "away from home," —from both homes,—and Paul evidently contemplated it as possible that, long before "our earthly house of tabernacle was dissolved," and long before being "clothed upon with our house which is from heaven," he might be "unclothed," "absent," but not forgotten, seeing that, while in life, he had so laboured that "whether present" or absent he might be "accepted of him."

This Scripture then, which has been considered one of the strongest proofs for the popular idea, that "the soul—the true personality"—at death wings its flight to the mansions of bliss, to be present with the Lord in the house eternal; viewed from the true stand-point, not only refuses to countenance the idea, but is one of the very strongest proofs against it. In fact, it deals a death-blow to the whole theory from which one would think it could never recover. For, had Paul not contemplated an interval of some duration in the "unclothed" state, but an instantaneous change from the "earthly" to the "heavenly," how could he by any possibility, have expressed an aversion to be "unclothed," and at the same time an "earnest desire to be clothed upon?" He knew that he could not be in the "heavenly house," and remain in the "earthly" at the same time! And hence it would reduce the apostle's expressed desires to absurdities. A man may be shivering in worn-out raiment, he may earnestly desire to be clothed with new; and he will have no aversion to cast off the old in order to be clothed with new; but if the new be not ready,—he will prefer to shiver in his worn-out rags, to being "unclothed" during the interval. Or a man may express an earnest desire to depart from an old house, and to enter a new one; but if the latter is only in course of erection, he will prefer to remain in the old with all its disadvantages, to being cast out homeless till the new be ready. No one would speak of a man as in a "naked" or "unclothed" state while only in the act of casting off one garment to put on another. Nor would any one think of representing a man as "absent" or "away from home," while only in the act of removing from one place of abode to another. But the popular idea of the "soul-man's" instantaneous flight from the "earthly house" (thought to figure the body) to the "heavenly," will admit of no interval in the "naked—unclothed" state;—will admit of no interval of being "absent"—"away from home." He must either be in the "earthly" or "at home in the heavenly house," seeing it is a

Digitized by Google

mere momentary, instantaneous change—but the "twinkling of an eye"—that it will admit of. Now Paul "earnestly desired" to make an instantaneous change from the "earthly house" to the "house which is from heaven;" but he knew that this could only be the case with these who are "alive and remain" in the "earthly house" until HE come who shall change them from the "image of the earthly" into the "image of the heavenly" to "dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." J. MILL.

Cupar.

DAWNING.

"While we look not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are not seen."—2 COR. iv. 18.

"ALAS! alas!
The joy hath fled from Life's dark path,
And sorrow sits beside the hearth:
Alas! alas!"

Submit: submit:
'Tis fate's decree, and human wit
Still strives in vain to alter it:
Submit: submit.

We must: we must:
Though Pride lies bleeding in the dust,
And Hope's sweet flowers are torn and crush'd:
We must: we must.

Yet hope: yet hope:
In darkness though thou here must grope,
Thy being hath an ample scope:
Yet hope: yet hope.

Beyond: beyond
The clouds and mists that round thee cling,
'Neath cloudless skies the sweet birds sing:
Beyond: beyond.

Then wait: then wait:
The leafless rod of thy dull fate
Shall bloom anon at Heaven's gate:
Then wait: then wait.

'Tis Love: 'tis Love:
For "God is Love" who rules on high,
He doth thy trust and patience try:
'Tis Love: 'tis Love.

Believe! believe!
The leaves on Faith's fair tree that grow,
Yield balm for every human woe:
BELIEVE! BELIEVE! * D. M. A.

Digitized by Google

CANON LIDDON ON IMMORTALITY.

(*Continued from page* 298.)

THE doctrine insisted on in the sermon we are considering is that "man is an immortal being, just as he is a thinking being, by the terms of his existence"—that immortality is part of "the outfit of his nature." How dogmatically this contradicts St. Paul's declarations that God "only hath immortality," and that eternal life will be bestowed on those "who by patient continuance in well-doing *seek for* glory and honour *and immortality*," we need not stay to point out. Our present business is with the *a priori* metaphysical grounds, developed out of man's inner consciousness by the verifying faculty within him, which this great preacher thinks sufficient to satisfy us that those of the heathen were right who held the soul to be deathless, or imperishable. His discourse is peculiarly valuable, as putting in a clear and definite form the vague ideas that are often found floating about in writings on this subject.

His opening statement would certainly lead us to expect something very vague indeed. After mentioning as what we "apparently forget"—although our writings abound with argumentative references to the fact—"that before our Lord Jesus Christ came, the best teachers and thinkers of the old heathen world were satisfied of the truth of the immortality of the soul," he adds, "And we shall be satisfied too, if we think how unlike the soul of man is to any material being." If we had his definition of the word "material," we should know whether to ask for his proofs that the soul is *not* a "material being." But assuming from what follows that he means something of which our bodily senses can take cognisance, our first thought is, that the dissimilarities may be indefinitely great and varied, without affording a shadow of proof that the soul can *never* perish, but *must* have a strictly *everlasting* life. Is there anything in the nature of the differences which proves it? Three are specified.

I. "The first consideration which meets us is, that the spirit or soul of man knows itself to be capable, I will not say of unlimited, but of continuous progress and development." We shall have occasion to speak presently of the way in which the term "man" is often used, as if human experience was uniform on this subject. But waiving that for the moment, we readily admit that so far as any given man *thinks*—"knows" is going rather too far—himself possessed of such a capacity, it may inspire him with hope that he has a capacity for immortality. That is, of course, a moral capacity for it. There is no physical reason, that we know of, why God should not keep an animal or a plant alive for ever, if he so pleased. But we feel it difficult to believe that he would confer an everlasting life upon any creature that was incapable of knowing and loving the Author of its being. This we conceive to be the fundamental reason why not to know God debars from eternal life; as the reason why *to* know him secures eternal life, is that God could never bring himself, if we may use the expression, to destroy a creature who was in loving fellowship with him. But when we have admitted the utmost that this capacity theory can carry with it, what does it come to? Must every creature necessarily attain to all that it is "*capable*"

Digitized by Google

of, or even all that it knows itself to be capable of? Where is the ground for such an astounding assumption? Do the facts before our eyes supply any? Do we find that people always attain to what they desire, and think themselves capable of, in this world? Does Dr. Liddon believe that they all will do so in the next world? Is there any believer in a future state who does not think himself capable of happiness hereafter, and desire it? Then ought they all to be "satisfied" that everlasting happiness is part of "the outfit of their nature," and that they must necessarily enjoy it "from the very terms of their existence?" Can our opponent fail to see that his avowed belief in "eternal weal *or woe*" blows to atoms the foundation on which it is made to rest?

But the strangest part of the matter is, that this able controversialist at once proceeds to saw away with his own hand the branch on which he sits, and is not stopped even by his manifest uneasiness as to the result of the operation.

"However vigorous the tree or the animal may be, it soon reaches the point when it can grow no more. The time comes when the tree has borne all the leaves and fruit and buds which it can bear, when its vital force is exhausted, and it is no more. The animal may have done its best, it may have reached a high condition of strength and beauty, but when its limit is reached it can grow no more. With the soul of man as a living and thinking power it is far otherwise; he has never exhausted himself. When the man of science has made some noble discovery, when the literary man has written a great book, when the statesman has carried a series of important measures, we cannot say that he has exhausted himself. The spiritual man is indeed dependent on the material man, and as the body moves on towards decay and dissolution it extends something of the influence of its weakness and incapacity to its spiritual companion; but even then the soul resists this and asserts its separate existence; the mind of man knows that each separate effort instead of exhausting his powers tends to strengthen them, and so he will go on continually making larger and nobler and more vigorous efforts. So, too, is it with conscience and duty; with these there is no finality. One great act suggests another, one sacrifice makes another easier; the virtuous impulse in the soul is not like the growth in the tree, a self-exhausting force, but it is always moving on, always advancing. 'Be not weary in well doing,'—this is the language of the eternal to the human will; but never is 'Be not weary of growing' said to the tree, or the animal, because organic matter differs from spirit in this, that it does reach the limit of its activity, and then it turns backwards towards non-existence."

He evidently feels that there is something shaky about the word "capable;" and so he slips from that into an argument that man's spirit does actually make a kind of progress wholly unlike that of the plant or animal. Well, even if this progress continued uninterruptedly to the moment of death, it would afford no proof of continuance after death. Suppose a young person in health is suddenly killed. His bodily powers have been continually developing up to the moment of death. Must they, therefore, necessarily continue to develope after death? If not, why must the thinking powers of the most vigorous intellect? And even if they did, how would that prove that the development must go on for ever?

We are not driven, however, to these conjectural arguments: for there are some patent facts, which we should have said the preacher "apparently forgot," if he had not endeavoured, with trembling hand, to parry the blow which they deal at his theory. Does the "thinking

Digitized by Google

power" of a man "never exhaust itself?" Does every one find "that each separate effort, instead of exhausting his powers, tends to strengthen them," and that he can "go on continually making larger and nobler and more vigorous efforts?" We must congratulate the Canon on the unabated energy, from the experience of which he no doubt writes thus cheerily. But does he imagine this to be the case with every man, and to the last moment of his earthly career? Has he never heard of the mind failing as well as the body? It would really seem as if he had not. For while admitting that "the spiritual man is dependent on the material man, and as the body moves on towards decay and dissolution it extends something of its weakness and incapacity to its spiritual companion," he adds, "but even then the soul resists this, and asserts its separate existence." Does it? We must again congratulate him on having never fainted, or received a stunning blow; otherwise he would have been aware that the human spirit may easily be rendered not only unable to resist or assert anything whatever, but absolutely unconscious of its own existence. And a little investigation, we think, would satisfy him that old age and infirmity often "extend" a good deal more than "something" of their own incapacity to the thinking powers. It could hardly be difficult for him to find "literary men that have written great books," and "statesmen that have carried a series of important measures," who have completely "exhausted themselves;" whose minds not only can make no further "progress," but are rapidly losing all the capacity they ever had. "However vigorous" their intellects may have been, they have reached a point where, *as far as we can see*, they "can grow no more:" they "have borne all the leaves and fruit and buds which they can bear," and their "vital force is exhausted." And in this condition, or in the state of unconsciousness above mentioned, they may die. What becomes of them then? We are not asking now what Scripture teaches on the subject, or what may be hoped for on other grounds: but what would this first of Dr. Liddon's three arguments lead us to expect? What do his own witnesses—the palpable facts before our eyes—testify? That at death the tree or animal "is no more," but the thinking power of man starts up into immortal vigour, and can never be suspended again, still less even "fade away into nothingness?" That when the bodily disease, which has so enfeebled the mind, reaches the point of absolutely killing the body, it sets the mind free to begin a new career of indefinite energy? That if the blow, which rendered the human spirit unconscious, had only been a little harder, it would instantly have increased the spirit's power perhaps a hundredfold? We are not denying it, or even denying that there are analogies in nature which may tend to render it credible: but do the facts here adduced lead up to the conclusion? Do they not, on the contrary, lead of themselves directly to the opposite conclusion? "*Satisfied*" with such a ground for believing in man's necessary immortality, "*if we think!!*" Surely—but respect for the Canon's great attainments forbids our putting the alternative. We will only say that the powers of the human mind, while perhaps "indefinite," are certainly not unlimited; and he has, perhaps, thought so much on other subjects, that he has had no spare energy left for this. But then why touch it at all? When a statesman of the French Empire replied to

Digitized by Google

the criticisms of some of his friends on a play which he had written, "It is not so easy to write a good play," the rejoinder was, "No, but it is so easy not to write a play."

II. "But there is a second consideration which demands notice, and it is this; that the spirit or mind of man is conscious of and values its own existence. It is not so with any material form. . . . Man's spirit lives more in the past and in the future than in the present, exactly in the degree in which it makes the most of itself. Man as a spirit looks back upon the past, gathers up its lessons, and lives it over again. Man as a spirit reaches forward to the future, gazes wistfully into its uncertainties, and maps it out as far as he may do so. Man as a spirit rises out of and above the sensations which make up to the animal the whole of life. Man as a spirit understands what it is to exist, and as he looks upon all other things around him he appreciates something of the unique grandeur of his being, and thus he desires to exist on beyond the present into the future, into the very distant future if he may, and the more the spirit makes of its forces the more he desires to prolong its existence. Thus the best of the heathen have believed in a life beyond the grave. These men could not believe in man's annihilation; they longed to exist in order that they might continue their work, and progress in that which they had begun in this life, and with this longing they believed that they would thus continue to exist. The longing was in fact a sort of proof that its object was real. How else could the longing be explained, if all enterprise in thought and virtue was to be broken off by death? At any rate, in this longing the spirit of man discovered its radical unlikeness to all around it, and discovered too the life beyond the grave."

Now let our readers observe the confusion in this passage between two entirely different things. "Man as a spirit desires to exist on into the future, into the very distant future if he may." To hold good for the argument it should be—to an *endless* future. But take it as it stands. If man *as a spirit* desires a future life, every man must do so; for every man has a spirit: and many persons are ignorant enough to claim a universal craving on man's part for personal immortality as, at least, an indication of universal immortality. But the Canon of St. Paul's knows very well that the Buddhists, who constitute *one third of the human race*, dogmatically reject the idea, and regard the loss of all personal individuality and consciousness by absorption into the Deity as the highest attainable good. Here is not only an enormous deduction from the strength of the argument such as it is, but subject matter for a counter question, namely, If the Creator has endowed every man with the stupendous gift of necessary immortality, how comes it that the testimony of this possession is so feeble within him, as to be utterly silenced in a third of the human family? But we should greatly understate the case, if we allowed it to be supposed that the remaining two-thirds, or any large proportion of them, had any real faith in their own immortality. Millions of them disbelieve in any future state, and millions more hardly give it a thought. Surely never was such a quicksand as this dream of human aspiration made the foundation of a gigantic superstructure.

Well, at all events, argues Dr. Liddon, "*The best* of the heathen believed in a life beyond the grave. These men could not believe in man's annihilation, and longed," &c. Yes, but that is quite another thing, and just makes all the difference: so that the introductory word "Thus," which we have omitted, involves a fallacy. It is not "as a spirit" that man longs for immortality, but as a spirit *in a certain moral condition*. The longing, therefore, can at most be adduced only as a

Digitized by Google

presumption of "*conditional immortality*;" or, in the Canon's own words, "that its object was real," not that all would attain to it. The spirit of man may have "discovered its unlikeness to all around it," and have thought that it had "discovered too the life beyond the grave;" but that such future life would be *everlasting*, and that in every case, even in the case of those who neither desired nor believed in it, could by no possibility be discovered, except from a Divine revelation. That it would be everlasting in the case of all who were brought into spiritual fellowship with God was dimly revealed from the first, and fully "brought to light" when "he who is our life" appeared on earth. That it would *not* be everlasting in the case of those who "judged themselves unworthy" of it, man was distinctly and incessantly warned, as by a continuous peal of thunder, from the day of his creation till the last page of inspiration was written.

SAMUEL MINTON.

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE RATIONALE OF THE DOCTRINE.

PART III.

What is the Resurrection?

THIS question may not unnaturally have suggested itself to the minds of some of the readers of our former papers, as they found theory after theory taken up, examined, and in turn rejected. Now we fully acknowledge the justice of the indignation often felt and expressed against one who deprives faith of any shelter, however frail and inadequate it may be, and sends her naked and shivering into the cold and darkness of the night of doubt, unless he is prepared to provide her with a better and more enduring habitation. And on this ground we should have hesitated before exposing the weakness, as it appears to us, of the current theories of this great doctrine of the New Testament, unless we had been prepared to suggest another which commended itself to our own mind as at once more philosophic and more scriptural than any of those which have come under our notice, considered as in themselves and separately sufficient.

In mitigation of the charge of presumption, which will perhaps be brought against us, as supposing that we have either the knowledge or the ability to succeed where, according to our own showing, the greatest theologians of past ages have so signally failed; we can only plead, (1) That we are now, towards the close of the nineteenth century, in a much better position justly to appreciate the insuperable character of some of the objections which lie against the *literal-identity* and *germ-survival* theories of the resurrection—the only ones which can make much boast of antiquity—than were our pre-scientific forefathers: (2) That the legitimate influence of authority in the department of speculative theology—and no theory of the resurrection can be regarded as more than specu-

Digitized by Google

latively true—is now much more accurately estimated and soberly restricted than in past times: (3) That some of the results of modern science, philosophy, and biblical criticism afford us new light as to the nature of the problem to be solved, and the existing data for its solution, which was not available before; and (4) That the vital connection of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead with certain current opinions as to man's present constitution and future destiny, seems to render its careful re-examination and re-statement indispensable, and nowhere than in the pages of the RAINBOW more appropriate.

To all that can be said, with show of reason and honest appeal to Scripture, in defence of any of the theories which have been controverted, we at least will give a candid and careful attention; while to all that may be objected against the theory we are about to suggest, we promise a still more earnest and respectful hearing. One thing only we must, even by anticipation, protest against, namely, that the question should be juggled with after this fashion, "God has said that he will raise the dead body out of the grave; and I believe it, though it is contrary to my reason." This we shall take leave to consider "an argument of despair." We have no more right to assume this position in reference to the question of resurrection, than the "orthodox" holder of the doctrine of eternal torments has to say, in like manner, "God has said the wicked shall be eternally tormented; I believe it, though it is contrary to my moral consciousness." In both cases alike the point to be decided is, Have we rightly understood and interpreted what God *has* said?

Before proceeding, however, to trace the outlines of what seems to us at least a closer approximation to a Scriptural and philosophic rationale of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead than has hitherto, to our knowledge, been formulated, it will be desirable to state certain *conditions* to which any theory of the resurrection is bound to conform before it can be regarded as even speculatively true, and by the failure of conformity to which it stands at once self-refuted. These conditions are the following:—

I. It must be fairly in accordance with the teaching of Scripture on the subject, *taken as a whole*, without unduly exaggerating the importance of some particular passage, peculiarity of expression, or mode of illustration; bearing in mind the much needed but little heeded caution, that "the varying terminology adopted by so large a number of Scripture writers, renders it impossible to extract from them (either) a homogeneous psychology," or eschatology.

II. It must not, by an obstinate adherence to the servile interpretation of Scripture language, contradict the well-established facts of science and experience. For true science, which is simply our knowledge of God's method of working in nature, is, *as far as its legitimate sphere extends*, as much a revelation of the Divine will to us as any words written by Paul, or Peter, or John.

III. It must not be based on some wholly gratuitous assumption, to which neither Scripture nor reason afford any adequate support. If we plant an unknown seed in a particular spot in our garden, and in due time there grows up in that very spot a flower such as we had never seen before, we are fairly warranted in concluding that it sprang up from the seed we sowed. But simply because such a flower appears we must

Digitized by Google

not *assume* that we sowed the seed; nor, having sown this seed must we *assume* that it will produce a particular kind of flower. In other words, hypothesis in connection with this subject can only be admitted when it starts from facts and enables us to reach ascertained results.

IV. It must not fail to include the ultimate restoration of the material element in the complex unity of man's nature; or to recognise the fact that without such a restoration man's nature must remain mutilated and the explicit promises of Scripture broken.

V. It must not involve the supposition of a solution of the continuity of man's being; as though he could be abolished out of God's universe for a time and yet have a renewed existence, which is not only clearly contrary to Scripture but metaphysically and morally impossible.

Now if we apply these conditions, by way of test, to the theories we have previously considered, we find that the *literal-identity* theory violates the first and second; that the *germ-survival* theory violates the first, second, and third; that the *re-incarnation* theory violates the first and fifth; and that the *spiritual-body* theory violates the first and fourth. What we claim for the theory we are about to advance is, that whatever difficulties may attach to it, and we fully recognise the existence of difficulties; or whatever may be the weakness of some of the links in the chain of deductions, and we quite acknowledge the existence of weak links; it at least fairly observes all the above conditions, and therefore has a claim to be considered as speculatively true, till a better and more complete theory can be propounded.

We commence, then, by observing that for the most important testimony of Scripture on the subject of the resurrection of the dead we are dependent on the writings of the Apostle Paul; not only from the fact that he has treated of it much more fully than any other of the New Testament writers, but also because he was, as he plainly intimates in 1 Thess. iv. 15, the recipient of immediate and special revelations from the Lord in regard to it: whence arises, doubtless, the authority and assurance with which he writes of it in several places. A scriptural theory of the Resurrection, therefore, must be essentially a Pauline theory, and his explicit statements and more accurate use of terms may fairly be taken as our landmarks and guides when we have to deal with statements occurring in the other Scriptures; for it is not too much to say that apart from his writings our knowledge of the whole subject would be too general and too scanty to furnish the data for any theory whatever. What, then, does Paul say about the resurrection of the dead? As at once a starting point for our inquiry, and the foundation-stone of the theory we have to present, we will take his very important, and, as we conceive, little appreciated statement in 2 Cor. v. 1-9, which we thus translate from the best texts: "For we know that if our earthly tent-dwelling should be destroyed, we have a building from God, a dwelling not made with hands, in the heavens, age-abiding. For in this we groan, longing to clothe ourselves with our house which is from heaven; seeing that we shall in truth be found clothed, not utterly naked. For we that are in the tent do groan, being weighed down: not that we desire to be unclothed, but clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life. But he who wrought us unto this very thing is

Digitized by Google

God, who gave us the Spirit as an earnest. Therefore we are always of good courage, and know that whilst we are in our home in the body, we are away from home, from the Lord. (For we walk by faith not by appearance.) We are of good courage, and well-pleased rather to be from home out of the body, and to be at home with the Lord. Wherefore, also, we aspire, that whether present or absent we may be well-pleasing unto him."

That the phrases *ἡ ἐπίγειος ημῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους*, and *οἰκίαν αχειροποίητον, αἰώνιον*, refer respectively to our present earthly and perishable body, and our future resurrection body, is acknowledged by almost all commentators; the only question which can fairly be raised being whether by the latter phrase, which we have translated "a dwelling not made with hands, age-abiding," the apostle refers to a body which we shall find ourselves in possession of immediately after death, or one which we shall receive only at the resurrection of the last day. As to this, Calvin,—always judicious where his special theology is not involved,—says: "The body, such as we now have it, he (Paul) calls a *house of tabernacle*. For as *tabernacles* (or huts "*loges*") are constructed for a temporary purpose, of slight materials, and without any firm foundation, and then shortly afterwards are thrown down, or fall of their own accord, so the mortal body is given to men as a frail hut, to be inhabited by them for a few days. The same metaphor is made use of also by Peter in his Second Epistle (2 Pet. i. 13, 14); and Job, (iv. 19) when he calls it a *house of clay*. Paul places in contrast with this a *building of perpetual duration*. It is not certain whether he means by this term a condition of blessed immortality, which awaits believers (immediately) after death, or the incorruptible and glorious body, such as it will be after the resurrection. In whichever of these senses it is taken, it will not be unsuitable; though I prefer to understand it as meaning, that the blessed condition of the soul after death is the commencement of this *building*, and the glory of the final resurrection is the accomplishment and consummation of it. This exposition will correspond better with the Apostle's context."*

It certainly appears to us that the grammar of the first and second verses would most naturally have led expositors to conclude that the apostle was speaking of some "building" which we should be in possession of whenever our present "tent" should be taken down,† and prevented them from supposing him to perform the marvellous acrobatic feat of overleaping a few millenniums,—certainly a very "elastic spring," to use Mr. Waylen's phrase,‡—had not this very important passage unfortunately been one of those generally looked at through a mist of dogmatic preconception. Paul, let it be observed, speaks in the present tense, not in the future,—"We *have* a building of God," he says, not "We *shall have*:" and moreover he affirms, in the third verse, that even

---

* "Commentary on the Corinthians," *in loc.* C. T. So.

† "Καταλυθῇ, the conditional proposition, with indic. *ἐχαμεν* following, denotes certainty and synchronousness of result: "when it is—we have.' "—*Webster and Wilkinson*, "Greek Testament," *in loc.*

BENGEL says: "*We have*—Present tense: immediately upon the dissolution of the earthly house."—*Gnomon.*

‡ See June RAINBOW, p. 243.

Digitized by Google

when divested of this garment of mortality, "we shall not be found utterly naked." For the conditional form, in the original, is not intended to convey any doubt, but rather the sentiment that inasmuch as we shall *still have clothing*—an inner garment as it were—we shall not pass into a naked state of pure spirituality, from which we naturally shrink.*

Accepting this, then, as the meaning which the Apostle intended to convey, let us notice three things which are very obvious in his statement:—

First. Observe the *assurance and authority with which the Apostle speaks.* He is not bringing forward a mere hypothetical conjecture, or illustrative analogy, as when he speaks of the seed in the 15th chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians; "WE KNOW," he says. "His words denote belief in the highest degree, even perfect assurance." Paul virtually asserts that: (1) The subject matter of what follows is verily the truth: (2) I possess conclusive proof of its truthfulness: (3) I pledge my apostolic authority and inspiration as to that truth. Thus he expresses a confidence at once perfect and sublime, disturbed by no doubts, but fixed and tranquil, like the repose of the Divine mind itself. And if we ask ourselves whence such confidence could arise, we at once call to mind Paul's many "visions and revelations of the Lord" (2 Cor. xii. 1-4); and especially that touching this very subject to which we have already referred.

Secondly. Observe again the extent of the concession which Paul here makes to the claims of science. Having once spoken of the dissolution of this flesh and blood body—this "tent dwelling"—in which he for the time being "groaned, being weighed down," he dismisses it from all further consideration. He has done with it apparently for ever, it is a thing of the past, part and parcel of that old, evil, perishable Adamic nature, which he joyfully puts off as day by day the new, holy, immortal Christ-nature is put on. Let science demonstrate the fact that the human body—that is the flesh—is in a state of constant flux; that as often as once in seven years the whole mass of matter composing it is changed; that sooner or later after death it is inevitably resolved into its constituent chemical elements, and that these elements are again and again included in the varied forms of vegetable and animal life; so that the identical molecules which now compose my earthly body may previously have belonged, or may hereafter belong, to ten thousand other bodies,—Paul concedes all this not only by the use of the word καταλυθῇ, *dissolved, disunited, broken up*, as applied to the body, but also by drawing so sharp and clear a distinction between this "earthly tent-dwelling" and the "building from God" with which he contrasts it. There is in fact, as it has been truly said, "no possibility that science, whatever may be the degree of its advancement, can find that the earthly body after death undergoes a change more complete and radical than is expressed by the word καταλυθῇ."

Thirdly. Paul at the same time no less evidently implies that the departed exist with bodies, though bodies of a very different character and belonging to a perfectly distinct sphere of existence. "We have a building from God, a dwelling not made with hands, in the heavens, age-abiding."

* Webster and Wilkinson, *in loc.*

Digitized by Google

Mark here several things in reference to this body which we shall, if in Christ, possess when our "earthly tent-dwelling is dissolved." (1) It is "a building *from God* (ἐκ Θεοῦ), that is to say a structure of Divine origin, "begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." "Not made with hands" (ἀχειροποίητον) which in this connection may well mean not dependent on human agency or of human generation, as the same expression must we think be understood in Hebrews ix. 11, where it appears to be used of Christ's resurrection body.* (2) It is a body "in the heavens" (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς), that is, not partaking of the grosser matter or belonging to the order of the present visible kosmos: in other words it is a body of an ethereal refinement and tenuity—"spiritual" in the earlier and unmetaphysical sense of the word—a body of substantial forces which the soul pervades and holds in indissoluable union with itself as essentially and fundamentally our body; that body around which the passing perishable elements of the earth-made organism are throughout this life ever gathering and again dispersing. It is this inner spiritual body which, eliminated at death from its material envelopment, will constitute "the building from God" of which Paul here speaks. It is this spiritual body in which, in point of fact, Professor Westcott's "specific law or formula of assimilation and combination," and Professor Perowne's "principle of identity which governs the formation of the body,"† will find their actual realisation. And it is the recognition of its existence and reality which at once supplies the true key to all the real phenomena of mesmerism and spiritism, shows us the missing link between natural science and revealed eschatology, and affords a solid and sufficient basis on which to build the great Scripture doctrine of the *Anastasis*.

(3) Once more, this spiritual body of which the apostle speaks is "age-abiding" (αἰώνιον). It belongs not to the region of "things seen and temporal," but to the wider realm of "things unseen and eternal." For it is important to observe that the application of this word αἰωνίους to this spiritual body is quite incompatible with the idea of its being a mere temporary vehicle of the disembodied spirit without which it would be lost and merged in the infinite ocean of the Divine existence, to be succeeded in turn by the glorified body at the last day. It must, on the contrary, mean a permanent spiritual corporeity capable of co-existing in a germinal form with our present body of flesh and blood, on the one hand, and on the other, in its final and complete development, with the material body of the ἔγερσις. It is a body, the existence of which is to be measured not by the few brief days of this mortal life, but the mighty æons of eternity; and whose powers, uncircumscribed by the narrow limits of this frail mortality, will exempt it from the control of mere material laws. No sword can wound it; no want of sustenance weaken it, no prison walls intercept it. It is not the soul—the ψυχή—and must not be confounded with it, as is done by G. S. Faber, Serjeant Cox, and Mr. Gillingham,‡ otherwise the Scriptural trichotomy of body, soul, and

* Compare Mark xiv. 58.

† See the important quotations given in May RAINBOW, p. 222.

‡ See "The Many Mansions in the House of the Father;" "The Mechanism of Man;" and "The Seat of the Soul."

"The corporeal element," says Beck ("Outlines of Biblical Psychology"), is

Digitized by Google

spirit (1 Thess. v. 23) will be destroyed, but something which is essential to the soul's retention of identity and consciousness of personality; an absolutely unembodied finite existence, call it "soul" or "spirit" as you will, being simply a contradiction in terms.

Hence, in point of fact, the supposition of the possession of some such spiritual body as Paul here predicates of himself and his brethren, upon the dissolution of the mortal body, is a philosophical necessity, if we would maintain the continued existence of the human *soul*,—under which term we here include the human spirit, as does our Lord in Matt. x. 28,—with any of the attributes of finite personal existence; while the loss of these would involve such a solution of continuity as must render the supposition of its individual existence hereafter inconceivable. The most distinguished Christian metaphysicians and psychologists now hold that the idea of a creature destitute of bodily form is unthinkable. Thus the distinguished German commentator Kurtz observes: "God alone is an infinite, and absolute spirit. He only exists above and beyond time and space. A created spirit without a corporeal form to confine it to time and space, to bound its being and give it a species of form, must either be like God, infinite, omnipresent, and eternal,—be God himself; or, since that would be inconsistent with the idea of its having been created, be dissipated into nothing and utterly lost. Hence within the province of created life, the possession of a body is the condition of all existence; the corporeal structure is the instrument of all activity of the spirit; it constitutes a tenement for it, gives it a lodgment, and thus enables it to preserve its legitimate boundaries and identity,—without a body, without a fixed abode, the homeless spirit would be carried away everywhither and dissolved into nothing—be utterly lost."*

To the same effect a Christian philosopher of our own, Isaac Taylor, writes: "Without question we must affirm that Body is the necessary means of bringing Mind into relationship with space and extension, and so, of giving it—PLACE. Very plainly, a disembodied spirit, or sheer mind, is NOWHERE. Place is a relation of extension; and extension is a property of matter: but that which is wholly abstracted from matter, and in speaking of which we deny that it has any property in common therewith, can in itself be subject to none of its conditions; and we might as well say of a pure spirit that it is hard, heavy, or red, or that it is a cubic foot in dimensions, as say that it is *here* or *there*, or that it has come, and is gone. It is only in a popular and improper sense that any such affirmation is made concerning the Infinite Spirit, or that we speak of God as *every where* present. God is in every place in a sense altogether incomprehensible by finite minds, inasmuch as his relation to space and extension is peculiar to infinitude. Using the terms as we use them of ourselves, God is not here or there, any more than he exists now and then. Although, therefore, the idea may not readily be seized by every one, we must, nevertheless, grant it to be true that, when we speak of absolute immateriality, and wish to withdraw mind altogether from matter, we must no longer allow ourselves to imagine that it is, or

present in the life of the soul, but it is present only under the form of body, that is to say, as the immediate instrument of the vital operations."

* "The Bible and Astronomy."

Digitized by Google

can be, in any place, or that it has any kind of relationship to the visible and extended universe. . . . There is reason to conjecture (perhaps stronger terms might be used) that none but the Infinite Spirit can be more than a latent essence, or inert power, until compacted by some sort of restraint. . . . There is some reason to question whether sheer spirits could (except by immediate acts of Divine power) be individually dealt with and governed, or could be known and employed, or could be followed and detained, or could form lasting associations."*

With these conceptions the maturest conclusions of science are in perfect accord. The distinguished authors of *The Unseen Universe* observe: "If in the body there be no other material than a certain quantity of phosphorus and other things, such as we know them in the common state, and if individual consciousness depends upon the structural presence of these substances in the body and the brain, then when this structure falls to pieces, there are, of course, reasonable grounds for supposing that such consciousness has entirely ceased. But it is the object of this volume to exhibit various scientific reasons for believing that there is something beyond that which we call the visible universe; and that individual consciousness is in some mysterious manner related to, or dependent upon, the interaction of the seen and the unseen. . . .

"One of the essential requisites of continued existence of the individual is the capability of retaining some sort of hold upon the past: and, inasmuch as we are unable to contemplate such a thing as a finite disembodied spirit, it is further evident that this hold implies an organ of some sort. This we conceive to be a perfectly general proposition. We do not limit ourselves in making it to any particular arrangement of bodily form, or to any particular rank of finite organised intelligence. From the archangel to the brute we conceive that something analogous to an organ of memory must be possessed by each. . . . .

"But if one general requisite of independent and responsible life be a connection with the past, another is the possibility of action in the present. A living being must have in his frame the capacity of varied movement. He must possess a bodily organisation in which there is the power of calling internal forces into play at irregular intervals dependent on his will. We cannot imagine life to be associated with a motionless mass which moves in an invariable manner.

"The living being need not always be in motion, but he must retain the capacity of moving. He need not always be thinking, but he must retain the capacity of thought. He need not always be conscious, but he must retain the capacity of consciousness. . . . . .

"Let us therefore begin by supposing that we possess a frame, or the rudiments of a frame, connecting us with the invisible universe, which we may call the spiritual body.

"Now each thought we think is accompanied by certain molecular motions and displacements in the brain, and part of these, let us allow, are in some way stored up in that organ, so as to produce what may be termed our material or physical memory. Other parts of these motions are, however, communicated to the spiritual or invisible body, and are

* "Physical Theory of a Future Life." Edition 1857, pp. 23, 24, 25, 41.

Digitized by Google

there stored up, forming a memory which may be made use of when that body is free to exercise its functions. . . . . .

"We can therefore very well imagine that after death, when the spiritual body is free to exercise its functions, it may be replete with energy, and have eminently the power of action in the present, retaining also, as we have shown above, a hold upon the past, inasmuch as the memory of past events has been stored up in it, and thus preserving the two essential requisites of a continuous intelligent existence.

"All that we have done is to remove the scientific objection to a future state, supposed to be furnished by the principle of continuity. We know nothing about the laws of this state, and conceive it to be quite possible, if otherwise likely, that the spiritual body may remain veiled or in abeyance until the resurrection. We maintain only that we are logically constrained to admit the existence of some frame or organ which is not of this earth, and which survives dissolution—if we regard the principle of continuity and the future state as both true. Besides, the analogy of Paul, in which the body at death, is compared to a seed put into the ground, not only implies some sort of continuity, but also expresses his belief in a present spiritual body. '*There is*,' says the apostle, (observe, not *there shall be*,) 'a spiritual body.' Again, the same apostle tells us (2 Cor. v. 1), 'That if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, *we have* a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.'"*

It is at least an interesting question whether experience is capable of affording any evidence in support of this argument. Mr. James Gillingham, a surgical mechanist of Chard, affirms that it is, and in his curious little book on *The Seat of the Soul*, he gives a number of cases met with by him in the exercise of his profession, of persons who, having lost limbs, yet feel that in a certain sense they still possess them. A few of these we will quote. "The first case is that of a gamekeeper in the employ of Viscount Bridport, who had his arm blown off whilst ramming home a charge of powder into a cannon, which accident necessitated the amputation of the limb at the shoulder-joint. Five years have passed away, and during this period the keeper's arm has mouldered to dust in the churchyard; still he feels that he has a hand and arm, though the material part is removed. Indeed, he feels his hand plainer than ever. He can put his hand in any position, or move any particular joint he thinks proper. He will hold his (spiritual) hand up before his face, and say, 'My hand is before my eyes. I cannot see it; but I know it is there, because I can feel it.' He says, too, that he could grasp a tool and use it, as he once did; but he cannot, because the material part the spirit once acted upon is amputated."

"Another case is that of a patient who had his leg amputated under the knee, owing to an injury caused by the explosion of a gun. He says, 'I still feel that I have a leg which I can never lose; and have many a time put down my hand to feel it, when suddenly I have found myself grasping an insensible piece of wood."

"Another case is that of a patient who had suffered the amputation of his leg in consequence of a white swelling, when eighteen years of

* Fourth edition, *passim*.

Digitized by Google

age. He departed this life not long since, at the age of seventy-two. I knew him personally. I was anxious to know whether, after he had lost his leg fifty-four years, time had worn out this sensitive feeling. On my inquiring of his daughter, she said she had heard her father say that he had many a time felt his leg, and that in his last illness the limb became more sensitive than ever. When he turned in bed, and moved one leg, he moved the other also."

Another case may be mentioned,—"that of a patient who had his shoulder-blade and arm taken out altogether. He now lives and enjoys good health. I had been corresponding with him a short time, and was very anxious to know whether the taking away so large a portion of the body cut off the connection of the feeling of the hand and arm. I took the liberty of asking him. He kindly replied and said, 'All that can be said of the gamekeeper can be said of me. I feel my hand and arm plainer than ever. By day my arm is close by my side, and my hand rests upon my hip; but by night my hand and arm rest over my chest."

To these cases, selected from a larger number given by Mr. Gillingham, many others might be added from independent sources. We will give only one. The late Dr. George Wilson, of Edinburgh, thus describes his sensations subsequent to the amputation of his foot, "I have no feeling of the want of a foot, and seem still to feel toes, great and small. John Cairns * thinks this must arise from a pre-ordained harmony between the soul and body!!! Well done, John!" †

We are of course aware of the received scientific explanation of this curious phenomenon, namely, that "the nerves connecting the lost leg with the brain, which is the seat of sensation, have been so long accustomed to convey the actual sensations from the living limb, that after the severance of the limb the mutilated nerves continue to act by suggestion or by sympathy with the nerves of the other limb with which they had been accustomed to work in concert, and repeating the action induce in the brain a revival of the impression, although, in fact, it is only self-induced. The brain, consequently, receives the same impressions as before, and the conscious self instinctively transfers them to the same source, allocuting them in the same position in the structure to which it was accustomed to refer them before the limb was lost." Mr. Gillingham meets this argument, however, by adducing the case of a woman, to whom he was called upon to supply an artificial limb, who had been *born with one arm only*. "I was anxious," he observes, "for her testimony, as I had not met with a similar case before. It is no less marvellous than true, though she never had a hand or forearm, she feels that she has a hand and arm (or what some would call the rudiments of the hand and arm), and when she folds her arms together, she feels for the moment as if she folded one hand and arm into the other. Now this is not a case of amputation. But here is the fact (and it is fact I have to deal with), the spiritual hand and arm perfect, though it was never clothed with material. Malformation cannot affect the form of the spirit." Again, "Habit is said to be the cause of this spiritual feeling, after a limb is amputated. There could have been no habit in using the limb in the case I have just given. The patient never had a hand

* Rev. Dr. Cairns of Berwick. † Memoir by his Sister, p. 301.

Digitized by Google

nor arm to use, and is now over fifty years of age, yet the existence of the hand is felt."

Moreover, if the repeated testimony of clairvoyants is to be received, they are able, under certain trance conditions, to see the shadowy or luminous form of a lost limb occupying its normal position in relation to the body. Thus, Dr. Kerner tells us, that Madame Hauffe, "the Seeress of Prevorst," when she saw people who had lost a limb, saw a limb still attached to the body; that is, she saw the nerve-projected form of the limb.

We are not disposed to attach much weight to these curious phenomena, but maintain, as the basis of our theory of the doctrine of the *Anastasis*, and as a necessary inference alike from the metaphysical conception of finite personality, the scientific law of continuity, and the natural and unbiassed interpretation of the language of the Apostle Paul in the passage to which attention has been directed, that the spirit of a regenerate man—the scope of the passage does not warrant us in extending the argument beyond this—has its permanent abode after the dissolution of the material organism in an ethereal or spiritual body, whereby its personality, consciousness, and memory are preserved. That it is not at death either absorbed and lost, so far as its individual identity is concerned, in the Infinite Spirit,—like the minute portion of atmospheric air contained in a soap-bubble when the bubble bursts,—as some Christian materialists appear to maintain; or cast out naked and bodiless "into blue immensity,"—a supposition from which, by reason of its very inconceivableness, we instinctively shrink, even as Paul most unquestionably did when he said, "Not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life."

W. Maude.

(*To be continued.*)

PROBABLE TIME OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

THERE is reason to believe that Christians may know very approximately the time of the Second Advent.

"Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants, the prophets." (Amos iii. 7.)

"Who is wise, and he shall understand these things." (Hos. xiv. 9.)

"The wise shall understand." (Dan. xii. 10.)

To watch the signs of the times is considered by many to be very visionary work; yet for so doing we have the noblest precedents, and the highest authority.

The language of our Lord is sufficient warrant (Matt. xvi. 1, 3 and Matt. xxiv. 7); in which he clearly predicts that, at the time of the end, there will be increasing derangement in the powers of nature, great storms, pestilences, earthquakes, and national upheavings. We also remember that the Lord says, "When these things begin to come to pass, then lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." This implies that we should watch for these signs. But it is objected; such events and calamities as these have been through centuries past; why,

Digitized by Google

therefore, lay such stress on them as being signs of the end? True, they have been, and were, before these words fell from the great Prophet; yet that he did choose them for signs, there can be no question.

Query: Does it necessarily follow that things adopted for signs should have had no previous existence? When the Lord appointed the rainbow as a sign that he would no more drown the earth—had there been no bow of bending beauty prior to that day?—surely there might have been, probably was. Was not the meaning of the Divine Appointer simply that, As surely as I do set my bow in the clouds, "it shall be a token of covenant between me and the earth?" Then with regard to these signs of which Jesus spake, did he not mean that such solemnities would be greatly increased both in number and magnitude, succeeding each other with startling rapidity, and at the present date all but co-existent?

Has it not been growingly so within the last few years? And now all his signs—may we repeat it?—are all but co-existent, if not quite so, "WATCH."

And as to precedent. None more noble than that which the character of the children of Issachar affords (1 Chron. xii. 32); they understood the signs of the times; they were not visionaries. They were among the leading members of Israel, and though a tribe devoted to agricultural pursuits, and, as a rule, taking little interest in the public affairs of the nation, yet as they now come to Hebron to advance David to the throne, they receive the most honourable testimony to their wisdom and prudence as being wise to know when and how to act; men who had understanding of the times.

Other individuals are noted for their wisdom, research, and understanding in the Scriptures; men who dared to receive a prophecy, and inquire into its meaning. Such were Enoch, Noah, the patriarchs, Joseph, Moses, Elijah, and David; men who answered the great end of their existence, who wrought for God, and, from an onlightened understanding, knew well what to do. Space would fail to write of the prophets, the apostles, the Luthers, and other kindred spirits of modern times, all model men, who sought first the kingdom of God; who, with untiring zeal, amidst sneers, scorn, and revilings, were staunch in their fidelity to Christ, faithful even unto death, "men valiant for the truth."

We believe that we have arrived at the time of the end; a period, the commencement of which cannot be definitely fixed. As in the dispensations past, they overlap each other; i.e., the last has not ceased to be, when the next in succession has commenced; hence the light of the Gospel is intensifying, as also the coming darkness is deepening: some see only the former, and others only the latter. We must seek the Spirit's teaching to comprehend the whole. We behold now a growing antagonism between the two, and in consequence, advancing, more trying times to those who would be faithful unto death. But this struggle will not long endure: the last events of this dispensation are at hand. The advent of the Redeemer very near.

Certain Scriptures have already been mentioned, as enjoining upon us the duty of looking for our "blessed hope." Such as Dan. xii. 3, 4, 9, 10, from which we learn that the things shown to Daniel were to rest sealed until the time of the end, but that when that time of the end was

Digitized by Google

come, "the wise should understand." So also at the very commencement of the Book of the Revelation; that book of wonders, intended, as it is, to unfold the solemn events of the last days, which must accompany the revealing of the Lord Jesus Christ; we read (Rev. i. 3), "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep —i.e., attentively observe, and treasure up—those things which are written therein: for the time is nigh." Yes, the time was nigh—for then John wrote and sent unto the churches, "the things which he had seen," viz., the vision of Christ as the High Priest walking in the midst of his churches; "the things that are," viz., the letters to the churches; which are indicative of Christian life and action until the Lord doth come; "and the things which shall be hereafter," for then began the historic or typical fulfilment in years of those things which must be developed literally in the last days. Why this declaration? that whosoever readeth, heareth, and attentively observes the startling sayings of this book is blessed, if it be not well and wise to make ourselves acquainted with it—if it may not be understood—and if it may not tell us approximately of the time of his advent? for its very title is the revealing or unveiling of Jesus Christ. There are also the following passages which the reader will do well to examine: Matt. xxiv. 42, 43; 1 Thess. v. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 1, 2; Rev. iii. 3.

There are passages of Scripture showing that God will reveal to his servants things which are hidden to the world generally, and which things his people should seek to understand; such, for instance, as Pro. xxviii. 5, compared with Psa. xcii. 6; from which we learn that "The brutish" (i.e., the heedless and unthinking), understand not judgment, but that they that seek the Lord understand all things." So, Hos. xiv. 9, "The wise and prudent shall know the ways of the Lord;" Dan. xii. 10, "The wise shall understand;" Amos iii. 7, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth (i.e., without revealing) his secret unto his servants the prophets." And the Lord Jesus said (Mark xiii. 23), "Take ye heed, behold I have foretold you all things." Note attentively 1 Cor. ii. 10-12, which teaches that they who possess the Spirit of God, shall understand the deep things of God.

The Lord Jesus also bids us "watch and pray that we may be accounted worthy to escape," which certainly implies that there are some things to be watched, and that the result of watching shall be the deliverance from evil. Moreover, the language of the apostle (1 Thess. v. 1-4) plainly shows that it is the privilege of the Christian to be on the alert, and to be in such a watchful state at the Lord's coming, that through a knowledge of the times and seasons, the Lord's coming will not be to him as the coming of a thief, bringing sudden alarm and destruction. Do not these Scriptures decidedly teach that it is possible for us to know approximately the time of the second advent? and that it is our privilege to know? "for," as the apostle writes in the ninth verse, "God hath not appointed us (the children of the light) to wrath, but to obtain deliverance by our Lord Jesus Christ." Not salvation—this they, as the children of light, had already obtained—but deliverance from the great tribulation, which should come upon all them who should remain upon the earth, after the resurrection of the firstfruits, and the great change to which the apostle refers in the previous chapter. (1 Thess. iv.

Digitized by Google

16, 17.) Well may he add, "Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

From the first two or three chapters of Matthew and Luke's Gospels we gather that some few at least knew the time of the Saviour's first advent; among whom were Anna and Simeon. That all should have known is proved by the very fact that Christ rebuked the Pharisees and Sadducees because they could discern the face of the sky, but did not discern the signs of the times.

Mark xiii. 32 is a passage often quoted to show that the general period of the Lord's Second Advent could never be known, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, not even the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Such however could not be its import, for it was only spoken in the present tense with reference to the then existing time, before the gift of the Holy Spirit upon the day of Pentecost, from which time the Lord said his disciples should "receive power from on high," and be guided into all truth by him who should "show them things to come." Neither was at that time the seal removed from the testimony of the prophet Daniel—nor the book of the revealing of Jesus Christ, given to the Church. We submit, moreover, that the exact day and hour of our Lord's return cannot be made known; but that the time will come, and is even now at hand, when the Church may be permitted to know something like the very year of his approach, we firmly believe. According to the testimony of Dan. ix. 27, a covenant or league of seven years is to be made between the antichrist and many of the Jews, for their re-settlement in their own land; and this covenant is said to be effected just seven years "before the consummation; and that determined shall be poured upon the desolator." When this shall take place, it is hardly possible to avoid knowing the time when the Lord shall return with all his saints.

From Dan. viii. 13, 14, it would also appear that the whole career of the Antichrist, or desolator, shall be for 2,400 days (for such is the number of days given in the older manuscripts), and this would be six years and eight months; which probably will be the exact time of his reign. The text more literally translated is as follows: "Then I heard one saint speaking, and the numberer of secrets said unto Palmoni who spake, How long the vision, the daily? (probably how long will be the vision of days; the whole time); and (how long?) the transgression which maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days (or 2,400); then shall the sanctuary be justified."

The whole of this is in round numbers seven years, during which time many Jews will have returned to Palestine and have resumed their sacrifices; but as they return in unbelief, with their hearts still hardened against their true Messiah, their sacrifices will be unjustified and unacceptable until Christ comes in his manifested glory, and they shall look upon him whom they have pierced, and believe. When, therefore, these events take place, the end may be easily known by those who watch.

Are we to suppose that the Son does not now know? May we imagine that even the angels do not now know? those wise and watchful ones; who are said into these very things attentively to gaze? (1 Pet. i. 12.) It may be that the great change upon the living, watch-

Digitized by Google

ful Christians, and the resurrection of the first fruits will take place just a little before the commencement of these events to which we have just referred, or just prior to the three years and a half, the last half of the above period. There are certain reasons which seem to favour either of these times for the date of the departure of the watchful church: this may still be an undecided point, but the question arises whether we are not very closely nearing certain circumstances and events which Scripture teaches are to immediately precede the manifestation of the lawless one? Are there not certain prophetic signs which are indicative of the nearness of our Lord's advent? We think so; as, for instance, the convergence to the present time of so many Scriptural dates; the preaching of the Gospel among the nations, prior to the end, in accordance with the prophecy of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 14); the wasting of the Turco-Mohammedan Empire; the preparation of the way for the Jews to return to Palestine; the gathering of the nations to war, &c. A consideration of these and others demands special attention.

"Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." (Rev. xvi. 15.)

"Take ye heed: behold I have foretold you all things." (Mark xiii. 23.)

There are certain dates in Scripture which appear convergently to end between the years 1866 and 1882, which also seems to be the opinion of many expositors of prophetic truth.

Many deem it very wrong to inquire into, much more to rest upon, anything like chronological data; but then the question naturally arises, wherefore are these dates given in Scripture? If by the Great Master we are bidden to "search the Scriptures," surely we are to give heed to the numbers which are noted in the sacred text. We are quite aware that many prophets and learned men, and even angels have searched into these things, and failed to discover what times the Spirit did signify when "they prophesied beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow;" but we also know that these things were sealed to their vision, though accompanied by the affirmation that at the time of the end "knowledge should be increased, and the wise should understand."

There are a few dates given by the Prophet Daniel which apparently for their fulfilment point to the present time. For instance, those of the twelfth chapter: the 1260, 1290, and the 1335; also the "time, times, and the dividing of a time," of Dan. vii. 27; coincident with the above 1260 days. In Dan. viii. 13, 14, we read, "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto 'Palmoni,' that certain one who spake, How long the vision of the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? and he said unto me, unto two thousand and four hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed (our version gives 2,300, but the older MSS. give 2,400 days); now 2,400 days are just six years and eight months. Probably the exact number of days, during which the "wilful king" will be in power; and noted in Dan. ix. 27 as the last week of years, during the last half of which the Antichrist is to rule and make desolate. These 2,400 literal days embrace the whole of the

Digitized by Google

vision of the daily (whatever that may mean), and the time of the desolating tribulation constituting the 1260 days.

There surely can be no doubt that the duration of the last action of the Antichrist is here given. But recognising as we do that there is also an historical or typical fulfilment in years of the visions of the Antichrist as given in Daniel and the Book of the Revelation, we have little hesitancy in considering this number as giving 2,400 years from the date of Daniel's vision. The prophet received his vision nearly, if not exactly in the year 534 B.C., which if deducted from the number 2,400, we are brought down to the year 1866, a year long anticipated as that which was likely to witness the end of the present dispensation; but one which did really witness the beginning of the last days, and which began a time of increasing trouble, speedily to culminate into the time of the great tribulation. We all recollect how full this year was of disasters; and from that time to the present each year has borne witness to great calamities, catastrophes, and crimes, both at home and abroad, such as our forefathers knew not. We believe there have been 2,400 years, through which the four wild beasts (or kingdoms) of Daniel's prophecy have been in historical fulfilment; and that there will be 2,400 literal days of the antichrist's power; that the former ended on or about 1866. What length of time may elapse between the termination of the years and the commencement of the days, we cannot say. It is a season which we are inclined to term that of night, in which fell the dynasty of the fourth kingdom in historic detail, the disappearance from the scene of action of the embryo Antichrist, the conclusion of the 6000th year of the world, the re-adjustment of the kingdoms preparative to the manifestation of the lawless one, and the beginning of sorrows which will terminate in the tribulation the great.

There is the period of 2,520 years, "the seven times," noted in Daniel iv. 16, and Lev. xxvi. 18, during which the Jews were to have the pride of their power broken, and be chastised for their unfaithfulness, and have their kingly power transferred to the four Gentile monarchies. We have above referred to the "time, times, and a half." (Dan. vii. 27.) Our readers will probably have understood that a "time" means a year of 360 days, which, in its typical or historic meaning, signifies a day for a year, according to Num. xiv. 34, and Ezek. iv. 6, represents 360 years. These, commencing at the time of the captivity, terminate about 1869-70, a period synchronising with very remarkable events, bearing especially upon the historical termination of the Gentile monarchies. The numbers, 1,260, 1,290, and 1,335 are of peculiar moment, both as they refer to the historical in years, and the literal in days. In their typical aspect they have had a common commencement about the year 534, when the Pope (whom we recognise as the type of the coming lawless one) first received temporal power by Justinian's code. They end respectively in 1794, when the temporal power of the Pope was broken by the French revolution; in 1824, when the Turkish power (Mohammedan Antichrist) began to wane; and in 1869-70 when, through the fall of Sedan and of Paris, the Pope lost all that was left of his temporal power. Of course we deem it impossible to fix with certainty the exact year; that may be ultimately permitted, but sufficient clearness is evinced to prove that we are closely approximating to the time of the end.

(To be concluded.)

Digitized by Google

THE DAY OF THE PARADISE.

1. "Then spake the chief butler unto Pharaoh, saying, I do remember my faults *this day*."—Gen. xli. 9.
2. "All the commandments which I command thee *this day*."—Deut. viii. 1; xi. 13; xiii. 18, 28; xxvii. 4.
3. See, I have set before thee *this day* life and good, and death and evil."—Deut. xxx. 15.
4. "Even *to-day* do I declare," etc.—Zech. ix. 12.
5. "Verily I say unto thee *to-day* [*semeron*] shalt thou be with me in Paradise."—Luke xxiii. 43.

THE reader's attention is called to the foregoing passages; the last one quoted being popularly supposed to teach that on that exact Jewish day, at some time between twelve at noon and sunset, the spirit or soul of our Lord, and the spirit or soul (nobody seems to know which) of the penitent thief, were to be together in what was vulgarly called Paradise, i.e., the elysian portion of *hades*, the under-world. It is claimed by critics and theologians that the comma must of necessity be placed after "thee," instead of after "to-day," and that the words of Christ will admit of no other interpretation than that the spirits (or souls) of the two were to be in a disembodied, conscious condition as soon as they died. The adverb "to-day," it is said, cannot by any means qualify "I say," but must of stern necessity, to make both grammar and sense, qualify "thou shalt be;" hence during that twenty-four hours, Paradise, already in existence, already come for mortals, should by both the dying men be entered and occupied.

"I doubt," as said Adam Clarke on another occasion. I question if any saint has yet entered "The Paradise." There is only one—that is God's. The hadean abode is right down in our earth, and I am sure there is no such Paradise *there*. Strange that Christians should imagine there is! Now touching this passage, and the others quoted, I observe:

1. In the words of Noah Webster, "the ancients were unacquainted with punctuation; they wrote without any distinction of members, periods, or words." So neither Christ nor Luke put the commas in Luke's written words.

2. Appleton's Cyclopedia informs us that the modern points, such as the comma, semicolon, colon, and period, "came into use very gradually after the invention of printing," which was in 1423.

3. The punctuation of a speaker's words and sentences is to be made in accordance with his natural pauses, and in agreement with the sense of the same; the punctuation not so much determining the sense, as does the sense determine the punctuation. The point is, what does our Lord mean? *not*, what shall we compel him to mean.

4. If we had heard our Lord utter the words recorded in Luke, and distinctly observed a natural pause after "thee," and an emphasis on "to-day," then might we yield the argument to our opponents. But no man this side the cross listened to the sacred promise to the thief. Luke, and he only—not another—recorded the dying words of the bleeding King. *It is written*—and the whole Bible must interpret it, aided by common sense.

5. Explained by the *usus loquendi*, or general usages of the word in Scripture, we know that Paradise, in the only passage that locates it at

Digitized by Google

all, is *not in* the bowels of the earth, where *hades* is, but (is in or) is the New Jerusalem which is above and is to come down on the new earth. (2 Cor. xii. 4 ; Rev. ii. 7 ; xxii. 2 ; and xxi. 2, 3.)

6. Explained by the thief's request, "Lord, remember me when thou *comest* into thy kingdom," there is here no allusion at all to the intermediate state, but to a period subsequent to the Second Advent, for Christ is yet to come into his kingdom, at the great day.

7. Explained by the kingdom coming and the thief's entrance thereto, the penitent's Paradise is still in the future, for no soul has yet gone into the promised "kingdom of God and of Christ." The kingdom has not come.

8. Explained in the light of historical fact, it is a matter of doubt if Christ and the thief died on the same current Jewish day. Their day both ended and began at "even," sunset, Christ died at three o'clock in the afternoon, but the two thieves lived until "even," and consequently until that "day" ended.

9. The disputed sentence, punctuated and interpreted in the light of the nine texts that head this article, does not of necessity teach the old Jewish notion that death was the door to an underground Paradise. For if it was proper and grammatical for the butler to say that he remembered his faults *that day he spoke*, when everybody knows that he did not mean the day before, nor the day after—if it was proper for the greatest of the Hebrew legislators to declare that he commanded a thing *this day*, when all know he meant no other day save the one on which he spoke—if it was proper for God to say, "Even *to-day* do I declare" a matter, which thing or matter related to the future, none doubting that God knew how to use words, and knew also what he was saying—then we do no violence to the words of the Redeemer when we make "to-day" qualify, describe, and determine *his saying*, instead of qualifying, describing, and determining the *time when* the two souls should enter Paradise.

10. Observe also, there is no difference between "to-day" and "this day," for the Greek *semeron*, found forty-one times in the New Testament, is in nineteen places rendered "to-day" and in twenty-two places translated "this day," so that "to-day" and "this day," are equal, one phrase being no stronger, no more definite than the other. Hence nothing is gained by playing fast or loose on "to-day."

11. Then, what harmony in putting the thief's request and the Master's reply in natural connection and order, thus: "You shall be with me in the Paradise when I come into my kingdom." The answer dovetails with the prayer; the penitent is answered as he requested; no more, no less.

12. AMEN I SAY TO THEE TO-DAY WITH ME THOU SHALT BE IN THE PARADISE. Read the words. I give them in successive order and with literal exactness. Now just put a comma after "to-day," and read again. Emphasise "the Paradise," as the Scripture does. It is not anybody's, nor everybody's Paradise, but *the Paradise*, pertinently and plainly, "The Paradise of God." (Rev. ii. 7.) There is nothing strained or forced in this view. On the contrary it presents a natural, easy solution of a vexed Scripture, an interpretation and solution that a quarter of a century ago compelled me to abandon the notion that Jesus here taught man's immortality in death. The Paradise is yet to come—is soon coming.—*D. T. Taylor, "Bible Banner."*

Digitized by Google

LITERATURE.

The Ritualistic Conspiracy. London: "Rock" Office.

THIS pamphlet, reprinted from the *Rock*, an organ of the Evangelical party in the Episcopal Church, with additions and corrections, contains lists of the "Priests" who desire the appointment of Licensed Confessors for the Church of England; of "Priests Associate" of "The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament;" of the Clerical Members of the English Church Union; and of the Members of "The Society of the Holy Cross." If the fall of the so-called Church of England, as a State establishment, would kill this shameful popery, the sooner that salutary catastrophe takes place the better both for religion and society. Every Englishman has a right to demand that the "*National* Church" either do its duty, or submit to the righteous sentence of annihilation. These "priests" are eating the bread of a Protestant nation and doing the work of papal Rome. For far less offences men are sent to penal service or imprisonment with hard labour.

The Sunday Question: A Christian and Common Sense View. A Lecture by John Page Hopps. London: Elliot Stock.

MR. HOPPS is a clever man, and though we think him on the weak side of "the Sunday question," he has done his best to make it look strong.

Thoughts on Immortality, Sacrifice, and the Struggle for Eternal Life, viewed in the Light of Reason only. By R. Brown. London: Elliot Stock.

MR. BROWN reasons well; but we are convinced that his knowledge of Christianity helped him greatly, whilst he honestly thought he was writing "in the light of reason only." The fact is, reason, unaided by revelation, has always been a blind guide on these high themes.

Israel; or, The Simultaneousness of the "Fulness" of the Gentiles, the "Fulness" of the Jews, the Coming of the Lord, and the End of Time. By L. D. Byron, B.A. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

IT is impossible for any man to do justice to such a comprehensive title as this in a tract of twenty pages. We tried to account for our disappointment without blaming Mr. Byron, and this is the way we did it. But "the end of *time?*" Why not say the end of the age or dispensation?

Millennial Glory; or, The Doom of Turkey and the Battle of the Nations; the Restoration of the Jews; and the Coming King of Jerusalem and of the world; as indicated by inspired and infallible Prophecies and Prophetic Dates. By Henry Folbigg, Esq. London: E. W. Allen, Ave Maria Lane.

WE thank Mr. Folbigg for as much of his pamphlet as we understand, but the greater portion of it is occupied with dates and figures, of which we feel rather shy.

The Story of an Old Church Hymn Book, as Related by Itself. London: Elliot Stock.

THE ruinous ritualistic substitution of Church and ceremonies for Christ and his gospel is earnestly lamented in this little book. The story is told with artless simplicity, and will be of service in certain quarters where strong argument would not be understood.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

SEPTEMBER, 1877.

THE DESTINY OF THE EARTH AND ITS FIRMAMENT.

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things that do appear."—HEB. xi. 3.

"And I saw a great white throne and him who sat on it, from whose face the earth and the firmament (heaven, Gen. i. 8) fled away, and there was found no place for them; . . . and I saw a new firmament and a new earth."—REV. xx. 11; xxi. 1.

I. THERE are only two sources of evidence from which man can obtain knowledge of the things that shall be. The one is revelation, the other analogy. The first, having its origin in God, is precise and certain. The second, resulting from scientific conclusions, can only prove an imperfect guide. Owing to the diversity of opinion on the subject of this paper I have no hope of bringing about a unity of faith, but I do trust that I may induce the children of the Creator to examine well the premises of their opinions that their decision may rest on conclusions drawn from the ways and Word of their Father rather than those of man.

II. I will first of all give the evidence of some of the most distinguished writers on this subject, being scientific theologians, and then proceed to test it by revelation. Dr. Hitchcock refers to the well-known passage in 2 Peter iii. 3-13, which I need not quote. He acknowledges the literality of the words, which he says it is impossible to deny, more particularly the statements of vers. 6 and 7, which follow one another in the same sentence. "No one," he adds, "doubts the literal destruction of the world by water; it would then be absurd to couple in the same sentence the most simple and certain literality with the strongest of all figures." Having admitted the preciseness of the Apostle's *revelation*, he qualifies the value of his admission by attempting an explanation of it on the ground of *analogy* and science. He asserts that the passages in question "do not teach that the earth will be annihilated,

Digitized by Google

but that the destruction will be only the ruin of the present economy of the world, not its utter extinction." The reason given is that "the apostle makes fire the agent of the destruction, and that the extent of the ruin that will follow depends on the effect that combustion has upon matter. The chemist," he says, "knows that not one particle of matter has ever thus been deprived of existence; fire changes the form of matter, but never annihilates it. When solid matter is changed into gas, as in most cases of combustion, it seems to be annihilated *because it disappears* (Ital. mine), but it exists as really as before. Since, therefore, biblical and scientific truth must agree, we may be sure that the apostle never meant to teach that the matter of the globe would cease to be, but obviously the reverse." Setting aside the idea of the chemist, that the globe might become gas by combustion, it may be parenthetically remarked that he who gave the elements their natures can use or change them at his will. Fire has ere now been completely divested of its consuming power by Divine fiat, as in the case of the three Jewish youths who were thrust into the fiery furnace of the Chaldean despot. Cannot the same will cause it to "burn up," to consume utterly that "*no place be found* for" the matter subjected to it?

III. The state to which Dr. Hitchcock would reduce the earth, through the agency of fire as seemingly implied by the Scriptural language, is "a liquid fiery globe," adding at the same time the words of the apostle, that "the atmosphere is represented as passing away with a great noise, an effect that the chemist would predict by the union of gases liberated by the heat." But the chemist must remember that the gases are not only "liberated," but that a violent explosion is declared by which the firmament is said to "*pass away!*" It is also certain that the sea must pass away, an event that Dr. Hitchcock's chemist takes no note of, though if it should remain it would seriously interfere with the formation of "a *liquid* fiery globe!" Being composed of two of the most inflammable gases, oxygen and hydrogen, the relative proportions which now form water being altered in a minute degree, will explode as violently as the firmament, and "*there shall be no more sea.*" (Rev. xxi. 1.) Taking only a preliminary view of such a state of things, the thought occurs that at any rate an earth without an atmosphere, and in a state of liquid fire, is for all purposes consistent with a residence for human beings, even in resurrection bodies of "flesh and bones," (Luke xxiv. 39 with Phil. iii. 21) destroyed. But more of this presently. I proceed to the evidence of

IV. Dr. Knapp, who says that the language of the apostle "is not annihilation, but we expect a new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;" his explanation of which is "an *entirely new, altered* (Ital. mine), and beautiful abode for man, to be rebuilt from *the ruins* of his former dwelling place, as the future habitation of the pious." This is anything but clear, for how an "entirely new abode" can be reconciled with one that is "altered,"

Digitized by Google

it is difficult to conceive. Would any man who had worn a coat for a length of time, if it were ever so cleverly repaired and "altered," or even ornamented, call it an "entirely new" coat? I trow not! and Scripture has suggested the thought, for it says, "the earth and the firmament . . . shall perish; . . . *as a vesture* shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed." (Heb. i. 10-12.) For what? For "a new earth and a new heaven."

V. Dr. Chalmers felicitously refutes the errors concerning matter and spirit by referring to the materialism of this present earth at its creation, when man "held unclouded fellowship with God with a prospect of immortality that death could not interrupt, being terrestrial in his condition but celestial in respect of character and enjoyment." He then proceeds to infer from such a state of things having been pronounced "very good," and "the morning stars" having "sung together" at the glorious workmanship of God and the beautiful garniture of materialism, that "the object of the administration we sit under is to extirpate sin, not to sweep away materialism. By the convulsions of the last day it may be shaken and broken down from its present arrangement, and be thrown into such fitful agitations as that the whole of its existing framework *shall fall to pieces*, and with a heat so fervent as to melt the most solid elements may be *utterly dissolved* (Ital. mine). Thus may the earth again become 'without form and void,' but without one particle of its substance going into annihilation." To all this there is one serious objection that I notice in passing, which is, that Scripture nowhere asserts that the earth shall be once more "without form and void," whilst there is plain authority for the sweeping away of all materialism that has been impregnated with sin. The typical instruction of Lev. xiii. 47-52; xiv. 43-45 gives notice thereof, and is precursory to the revelation which declares that "death and the grave, and the sea," together covering the area of the earth which is one vast tomb, having given up their dead that they may stand before the great white throne of the Judge of all the earth, "*the earth and the firmament flee away from his presence and no place is found for them.*" (Rev. xx. 11, 15.)

VI. Luther says that "God will make not the earth only, but the heavens much more beautiful than at present. Now we see the world in its working clothes; but hereafter it will be arrayed in its Easter and Whitsuntide robes."

VII. Dr. Pye Smith and Dr. Griffin, an American theologian, are both "astonished that any serious and intelligent man should have his mind fettered with the common" (? uncommon) "notion of a proper destruction of the earth. We can discover," they say, "nothing like destruction in the matter of the universe *as subjected to our senses*" (Ital. mine). They confess, like Dr. Knapp, their expectation of a new earth and firmament literally according to the Scripture, but presume to add to the Word of God their "opinion" that the present earth "will be restored by our Jesus, and will

Digitized by Google

arise from its ruins in tenfold splendour and more illustrious glory than before it was defaced by sin." Here, at any rate, Divine power is acknowledged to be necessary to produce this transformation and improvement; but the simple question is whether the analogy of Scripture as to the ways of God warrants such a supposition? The flood here is no example, for though the words of 2 Pet. iii. 6 state that "the world that then was perished" by the overflow of the waters, the Greek word used to express "the world" is κοσμος, which here signifies the ungodly inhabitants of the world, being placed in juxtaposition to and explanatory of the coming "judgment and perdition of ungodly sinners." (Ver. 7.) The words of 2 Pet. ii. 5 clear up the matter in stating that the flood was "brought in upon *the world of the ungodly*." It will not do therefore to use the word "perished" in chap. iii. in evidence that *the earth* was said to have been destroyed but that it remained intact still, and that thus it will be again. The *earth* is not said to have "perished."

VIII. Lastly, Mr. Constable, in the RAINBOW for December last, raises the question as to whether the expression "New heaven and new earth" is not "capable of two meanings," either "some place wholly different from the heavens and earth that now belong to man; or our present heavens and earth so *altered and improved* (Ital. mine) that they may be called new?" He inclines to the latter opinion, though I do not think that he, any more than Dr. Knapp, would say the same of an old garment "altered and improved." (§ IV.) But Mr. Constable refers to 2 Cor. v. 17, and says that "no one imagines from such language that the man spoken of as 'in Christ,' and, therefore, 'a new creation or creature,' has been annihilated and a different person created in his room." Certainly not. But a new creature or new creation is an element of resurrection life, of which the holy "seed remaineth" in the new man, and is that new creation by regeneration that "cannot sin, because he is born of God." (1 John iii. 9.) This will be fully developed as moral perfection in connection with the resurrection body. And be it noted that the body that now is, is "*not* that body that shall be," but a new body, "a house from heaven." (1 Cor. xv. 37; 2 Cor. v. 2.) The *old* man, with all that appertains to the corrupt state of flesh and blood, is said to have been "crucified with Christ, and *buried* with him." (Rom. vi. 4-6.) The new man has to faith been "raised together with Christ and seated with him in the heavens" (Ephes. ii. 5, 6). Here then is the "new creation" in the passage alluded to by Mr. Constable, involving no alteration or improvement of the old man, which with flesh is impossible, but an entire new creature according to the Divine view of the death and burial of the old Adam man, and the *new* man in Christ in resurrection perfection.

Mr. Constable (p. 594) refers also to Isa. lxv. 16, 17, in proof of his position, alleging that the oblivion of "the former troubles" connected with this earth (ver. 16), is stated to be "the creating a new heavens and new earth," and that therefore "this present

Digitized by Google

earth and atmosphere freed from all evil is the new earth and heavens" of ver. 17, and of the apocalyptic seer. Mr. Constable is almost right here, and I think would have been quite so had he placed the passage of Isaiah by the side of Rev. xxi. 5, where it is declared that "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, *for the former things are passed away;*" which "things" we are told in ver. 1, are "the first earth and first heaven," with the sea thereof, with which all the "troubles" of ver. 4 are connected, and which I conceive to be the same "troubles" as those of Isaiah lxv. 16. Then shall be realised the vision of the seer, "a *new* firmament and a *new* earth," on which "God will dwell" with glorified saints and be their God!

It would be occupying too much space to follow Mr. Constable into his references regarding the inheritance of Abraham, and his deduction that the promise to him of heirship of the world is that of the new heavens and earth; but it would be easy to show, what most of our readers must know, that the inheritance of Abraham and his seed is that of the land of Canaan during the period of the kingdom or thousand years' personal reign of the Son of man, the Messiah of Israel (Gen. xvii. 8, with Ezek. xlvii. 13, to xlviii.); not till the close of which is there mention made in Scripture of the new earth and heaven. (Rev. xx. 5, followed by xxi. 1-4.)

IX. I have now adduced much of the traditional evidence respecting the future destiny of the earth, which Dr. Hitchcock rightly says can only be determined by inspiration. Having admitted this unquestionable truth, he proceeds to call in the aid of geological science to demonstrate the phenomena attendant on that destiny. "This science," he says, "declares that the elements of the earth's final conflagration are contained within its bosom or on its surface," the result of which action, when let loose in full power, will be, as before stated, to reduce the earth to "a liquid fiery globe." But reasoning now from analogy as to what condition may succeed to this burning ball, he says, that existing agencies of destruction, such as volcanoes, have hitherto wrought a constantly increasing improvement in the condition of the surface of the earth, both as regards the organisation of climate and plants. "Thus," he adds, "we have reason to believe from the Christian Scriptures that the next economy of life will far transcend all that has gone before." And now let the reader consider the authority for attributing such a destiny to this present earth. It is first of all nothing less than the Divine record that there shall be a new earth and new firmament in Rev. xxi. 1 (an assumption which, made in respect to this earth, has to be proved), and this assumption supported by the mention that is made in the same chapter of the New Jerusalem! All this Dr. Hitchcock calls *figurative* language describing the most enchanting objects in nature "that are to exist on this earth renewed, exceeding in splendour

Digitized by Google

and perfection the drapery it now wears." This is certainly a novel application of the constructive and architectural glories of the metropolis of the new earth as stated in Rev. xxi.; independent of the inspired record of the fact, unobserved by our author, that the New Jerusalem, "*a holy* CITY," *is to descend* "*from God out of heaven.*" But where now is the determination of the question by inspiration which Dr. Hitchcock has acknowledged to be the only true source? Is not this God's Word with a human and fallible meaning?* Alas! it is sadly apparent from this part of the work of this author, greatly as in many respects he is to be honoured, that in order to support his theory of the alteration and redecoration of man's present abode, Scripture language is called "figurative" or "literal" according to human exigency, and without Divine warrant. For if Rev. xxi. 1-4, is figurative, then 2 Peter iii. 13, must be so likewise; but *having admitted the literality of the latter*, how can Dr. Hitchcock deny that of the former?

X. But he is troubled with "formidable difficulties." No wonder. He writes thus:—"If the present earth is to be burned up and melted at the last day, it must require thousands of years before another solid crust shall be formed capable of sustaining organic natures which are material. But the Bible represents the righteous at the day of judgment as reunited to their bodies, which they left in the grave,† and entering at once into their residence upon the new earth. Where then can we find the thousands of years which, by this theory, are essential to prepare this residence for their reception? Into what intermediate place, what new hades, shall they pass until verdure shall clothe the new earth, taking the place of the volcanic desolation which must reign over a world just beginning to cool from incandescent heat? I freely acknowledge this to be a serious objection to my theory, and perhaps insuperable, unless we resort to miraculous interference. . . . But I am unwilling thus to dispose of the difficulty; for it is a clumsy way to meet objections, when we undertake to philosophise upon events, to foist in a miracle to eke out our hypothesis." The obvious step then would be to dismiss philosophy and tell her to mind her own business; but Dr. Hitchcock does not approve, but venturing into the region of conjecture with philosophy as his guide he writes:—"Do we know of any form of matter in the present world which remains the same at all temperatures, and in all circumstances, which no chemical or mechanical agencies can alter? a substance which remains unchanged in the very heart of the ice around the poles, and in the focus of a volcano; which remains untouched by the most powerful re-agents which the chemist can apply, and by the mightiest forces which the mechanician can

* The explanation of the language of Rev. xxi. has been fully treated of in my work on "The Revelation," just published.

† Here he is in another difficulty, for he is opposed by 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37.

Digitized by Google

bring to bear upon it? It is the luminiferous ether, that attenuated medium by which light and heat and electricity are transmitted from one part of the universe to another by undulations of inconceivable velocity."

Our author does "not assert that the spiritual body will be composed of this luminiferous ether," but adds, "Since we know not the composition of that body, it is lawful to suppose that such may be its composition." Not as long as the words of Luke xxiv. 39 stand in partial explanation of Phil. iii. 21.

I cannot resist the following quotation:—"The question has often arisen, how the glorified body, if material, would be able to escape all sources of injury, so as to be immortal as the soul. In this hypothesis we see how it is possible; for though the whole globe should change its chemical constitution, though worlds should dash upon worlds, the spiritual body, though present at the very point where the terrible collision took place, would feel no injury, and safe in its immortal habitation the soul might smile 'amid the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds!'" Very poetical! but such dashing and crashing is scarcely to be expected on a new earth "wherein dwelleth righteousness," and where all is peace. What a chaos of hypotheses!

XI. Why cannot philosophical theologians give their minds rest from an unsatisfactory search after the impenetrable, and be content to rest on the decrees, the will, and the power of the Creator with which they cannot intermeddle? If "God spake and it was done," can he not speak again and it shall be undone? Cannot he who created the earth out of nothing, uncreate it into its original nothingness? The bearings of science upon the doctrine of a miraculous and special providence may only go so far as to assure the philosophers that they are but the handmaidens of the Divine record. All the evidence adduced for them does but prove that the agency of Deity in the operation of nature is a direct efficiency; that is, the laws of nature are only the modes in which Divine agency operates. If we suppose ever so many secondary causes to be concerned in natural events, the efficiency must, after all, be referred to God. Analogy and second causes had nothing to do with the initiatory work of creation, and they as surely will have no concern with the future destiny of the earth.

XII. Men *talk* and *write* about the earth; but let them *look* at it on the map of Mercator's projection. What a sad scene of ruin does it not present? Shattered and torn, each continent shows a serrated and jagged outline as if one part of the earth had been rent from the other by a convulsion to which the eighteenth Psalm can alone give expression, and of which it is most likely the history; whilst the earthquakes and rending of rocks at the flood, at the death, and again at the resurrection of the Son of God, afford a record of, as well as a reason for, the awful dislocation. Such was not the form of the earth when its Maker

Digitized by Google

pronounced it "very good," and adapted it as the theatre of man's probation. It is the sin of the creature that has caused these terrible acts of the Creator, so that now the earth is but in accord with its inhabitant man in alienation from God. It is impossible that such a memorial condition can remain when the earth and sea have disgorged the last evidences of human corruption! Is it not then a pleasing contemplation that the present "earth and firmament shall flee away" from the Divine presence and not a vestige remain in the dwelling place of righteousness to tell the sad tale of sin and sinners!

XIII. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work." (Psa. xix. 1.) Not a word about the earth! Did the Divine Author of creation foresee that the creature would assert the earth to declare the glory of man, scientifically, socially, politically? If this be popular opinion, it is well to remind such presumption of the words in 1 Peter i. 24, 25.

H. GOODWYN.

Wellington House, Clevedon, Somerset,

CANON LIDDON ON IMMORTALITY.

(*Concluded from page* 366.)

III. THE third argument brought forward as "a sort of proof," though "not strictly to demonstration," of this antiscriptural doctrine of universal immortality, is, if possible, even weaker than its predecessors. The extract is long; but in justice to the Canon, and, speaking honestly, to bring into full light its amazing futility, we must give it entire.

"Unless the spiritual being is immortal, such a being does count for less in the universe than mere inert matter, for matter has a kind of immortality of its own. As far as our own observation goes, matter only changes its form. We speak, indeed, of the growth and the destruction of trees and animals, but we must be careful how we speak of growth and destruction, if we mean by destruction more than a change of form, or if we mean by growth any addition to the real store of matter. No matter ceases to exist; it only takes a new shape. The body of the animal nourishes the plant which in its turn supplies the nourishment for another animal, and this animal is ultimately resolved into its chemical elements, thus completing the cycle, which is then begun over again. It is, indeed, possible that the destruction of the world may only be the change of the matter which makes the universe, for there can be no real increase or diminution of existing matter. Certainly every thoughtful believer in God knows that there was a time when matter did not exist, and there may come a time when he who created it will annihilate it; but with the tracts of time of which we can take account before us, matter has practically an immortality which would put man to a disadvantage if he ceased to exist at death. If man ceases to live at his death, then the higher part of his nature is so much worse off than the chemical properties of his body; for observe that man's spirit cannot be resolved

Digitized by Google

at his death: it must either continue to exist in its completeness or cease altogether. The body of William the Conqueror has returned to the dust; but if the memory and conscience and will of the Conqueror have perished, then his spirit has ceased to be, for the soul of man, your soul and mine, knows itself to be an indivisible whole; something which cannot be broken up into parts, and which must either live on intact or not at all. My memory, my affections, my way of thinking, and my feelings are all my own; they are not transferable. If they perish, they perish altogether; there are no atoms to survive, to be worked up into another spiritual existence. Thus the extinction of the animal or vegetable is only the extinction of matter, but the extinction of the soul, if such a thing could take place, would be the extinction of all which made man to be what he was. In the material world death and destruction are only change; but in the spiritual world if they take place they mean annihilation; and, therefore, there is at least a strong presumption that the spirit is not placed at such an enormous disadvantage with matter, and that if matter survives the destruction of the organic form, much more will the spirit survive the organic form with which it has been for the time associated.

We are sometimes represented as understanding "eternal life" to mean merely eternal existence, instead of what we do hold it to mean, eternal *living* existence; which, as the whole universe is to be reconciled to God, carries with it eternal blessedness. Now this confusion, falsely attributed to us, our opponent here has manifestly fallen into himself! "Matter has a kind of immortality of its own," because it never "ceases to exist,"—that is, "as far as our observation goes;" for he admits that the Creator *may* annihilate it at some distant date. Ceaseless existence is no kind of immortality at all, unless it be existence of that which has life! When any organism ceases to live, it is as completely *dead*, as if every one of its component atoms ceased to exist. This may seem to be a merely verbal error on the Canon's part; but it is in reality the foundation of his argument. The steps are these. For the component parts of an organised body that has been destroyed to remain in existence gives that body a kind of immortality. To have any kind of immortality is an advantage. Therefore an organised body, which can be destroyed only by being resolved into the material particles that composed it, has an advantage over a spirit which is annihilated.

Now, in the first place, we ask, How does he know that a spirit can lose its life, or be destroyed, only by annihilation? This is constantly put forward in various forms by men of his school. What becomes of the spirit? they ask. As it is not made of material particles, it cannot be resolved into material particles. True; but we suppose they will admit that it is made of *something*; and if so, why may it not return to that something, when as a spirit its existence is terminated? They *assume* this to be impossible; but it is obviously a mere assumption, grounded on our total ignorance of what a spirit really is. Why must it "continue to exist in its completeness, or cease altogether?"

Granting, however, for the sake of argument, that the human

Digitized by Google

spirit is strictly annihilated in the second death; what "disadvantage" would it thereby incur, in comparison with the body, which is destroyed by being resolved into its component elements? Who cares one pin's-head what becomes of the matter which formed his body, when the body as such ceases to exist? Is it any compensation to a man whose house has been burnt down, that it possesses "a kind of immortality" in the continued existence of its component atoms, and that it has escaped the "enormous disadvantage" of being annihilated? Would bereaved mourners be comforted by reminding them that not an atom of their departed friend's body has been annihilated, but that they are all fulfilling some useful function in the world of matter? To go further, would he like breaking a fly upon a wheel?

The preacher was candid enough to admit that "to minds of a certain order" these considerations "may seem to be poor and inconclusive." If there was not one mind, at least, there present which must have wondered at such arguments being brought forward in such a pulpit by such a man, we must abandon all trust in psychological inferences. His hearers were, however, assured that "they have led many a noble soul before now up to the very gate of the Church of God," and were entreated not to "think scorn of them." God forbid that any one should: "He that despiseth his neighbour sinneth." But even if any one ever was led up to the gate of truth by such transparent fallacies, which we utterly disbelieve, has he ever tried to estimate the multitudes who have been, and are being, driven away from its threshold by what they have been almost invariably taught to associate with universal immortality, namely, that in the vast majority of cases it will result in "eternal woe?" Can we wonder that any "noble soul," who seriously reflects on what it involves, should infinitely prefer that no creature should live for ever, than that even one creature should live for ever in hopeless misery? For a single member of a mortal race to attain immortality would be far more than sufficient to compensate for any temporary suffering endured by all the rest, however numerous; but who would be willing to purchase an immortality of blessedness for himself or any number of his fellows at the cost of an immortality of wretchedness to one of them? Would not every "noble soul" in the universe,—and with all the more urgency in proportion to its deliverance from selfishness and growth in love,—besiege the throne of the Almighty with ceaseless prayers and tears to blot them all out of his book and live for ever in his own solitary majesty rather than allow such a heart-rending spectacle to continue? Surely only "minds of a certain order" could bear to live in such a universe as Dr. Liddon pictures. Many loving hearts can indeed—oh marvel of marvels!—bear to *think* of doing so; and we honour the faith in God which makes them confident that whatever is to be, as well as whatever is, must be right; but they are most certainly in a dream; and the

Digitized by Google

first sight of such a hell as they have pictured to their own imagination, from an entire misunderstanding of three or four passages of Scripture, would make them wish that they had never been born, and that God had never performed that fatal act of creation, which has resulted in such a frightful catastrophe.

"This teaching of nature is presupposed by Christianity!" So we are constantly told. And it is the only possible way of even pretending to meet the persistent silence of Scripture on necessary human immortality. We ask, how it is, that in all the *sixteen hundred times* that the soul or spirit of man is mentioned by the inspired writers it is *not once* called immortal, deathless, never-dying, or anything of the kind? Orthodox preachers can hardly open their lips without using such expressions; why should the holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, *never* use them? Oh, they took it for granted, we are told. But why should they take it for granted? Only think of a revelation from God intended for man's salvation leaving him to infer so tremendous a fact as his own necessary immortality from such precarious premises as are laid down by Dr. Liddon, and scrupulously abstaining from uttering a word to confirm the inference. Where is the evidence that it is presupposed? What single statement is there in the whole Bible that implies this postulate, or even suggests it?

Shall we be reminded that man is made in the image of God? But for that to imply immortality, it must be assumed that an image must always last as long as its original,—which is absurd; and also in the teeth of St. Paul's declaration, that "righteousness and true holiness," which man has admittedly lost, was *not* part of the image of God in which he was created.

Will it be argued, that as Jehovah is "the God of the spirits of all flesh," *they* must "all live unto him?" If so, what peculiar privilege was it to Abraham, or to any who shared his faith, to have the Lord for their God in such a way as to secure their resurrection to eternal life? Why should Jehovah have told Moses that he was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, if he was equally the God of every one else?

Or again, that "the *Father* of spirits" must necessarily keep all his children alive for ever, whether it be a blessing or a curse to them? To us it seems in the last degree unlikely that he would do anything of the kind. And if it be urged that this universal Fatherhood must secure for them all an immortality of blessedness, which seems, *a priori*, much more plausible, we reply that Scripture absolutely bars the supposition of all being the children of God in any such sense. They are "his offspring" in the sense that they were created by him, and that "in him they live and move and have their being:" but their individual destiny is made dependent upon far other conditions. "The children of God" are "they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that (millennial) age and

Digitized by Google

the (that first) resurrection from amongst the dead." They "are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" who "of his own will begat them," not once for all in "solidarity" by creation, but "by the word of truth." They are "the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," being of those who have "received" Christ into their hearts, and to whom consequently he has "given power to become the sons of God." Is it the "solidarity" of "the children of God" and "the children of the devil" that is "manifest,"—or the reverse?

Shall we be reminded that some will rise "to shame and everlasting contempt?" But, in addition to the fact that the same word is applied in the last chapter of Isaiah to "carcases" which can scarcely be *immortal*, the statement itself implies that while the contempt or "abhorring," in which they are held will be everlasting, the "shame" felt by them will not be so; in other words, that though their evil deeds will never be forgotten, they themselves will cease to be conscious of it.

Shall we be told that some will "dwell with everlasting burnings?" But Bishop Lowth has clearly shown that this has no reference whatever to future punishment, and that it applies solely to the desolating ravages of hostile armies, of which the Jews asked in despair, "Who can live under these perpetual inflictions?"

Or will the impassable gulf between Dives and Lazarus be thought to presuppose the immortality of both? But that was in hades, the place of departed spirits, where the rich man's remorse at the thought of a misspent life is represented under the image of bodily suffering,—his actual body having just been "buried." And no one supposes that the wicked will remain *there* for ever.

Will our attention be directed to the worm which never dies, and the fire which is never quenched? But so far from this presupposing the immortality of those exposed to their influence, it absolutely excludes the possibility of it. For if a worm is to prey unchecked upon a human body, that body must sooner or later be eaten away: and if an unquenchable fire is to consume it, not a trace of the body can be left. And as the destruction of the whole man is represented under these figures, the whole man must in some way be put out of existence by that God who is "a consuming fire," —a result which is as distinctly foreshadowed by the scene of its occurrence—"Gehenna," or the Valley of Hinnom, outside the walls of Jerusalem, where fires were kept constantly burning to consume, and put an end to—not preserve—the corrupt matter that was cast into them. As applied to the punishment of living men, it represented, not a penal settlement, but a place of execution.

Or will our Lord's words in his parable of the sheep and the goats be quoted—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into everlasting life?" What, does this presuppose that they will *both* enter upon an everlasting life, "either of weal or of woe?" Could anything more distinctly imply that they

Digitized by Google

will not? That, in fact, the punishment will mainly consist in the *loss* of everlasting life; or, according to St. Paul, in "everlasting destruction?" Is that punishment *not* everlasting? How long does it last? Why, obviously, as long as they would otherwise have lived. And if, but for this punishment, they would have lived for ever, then the punishment continues for ever: it could only terminate by their being restored to life. The fallacy lies in assuming that a penalty retains its effect only so long as he who incurs it feels the infliction. St. Jude did not think so, when he spoke of Sodom and Gomorrha as still "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," though the fire had long since died out, and they had long since ceased to exist. The fire is called eternal because the effect of it was final and irremediable. And as, but for that fire, the cities "would have continued to this day," they are said to be still suffering its vengeance. "Eternal jugdment" does not mean eternal judging, nor "eternal redemption" eternal redeeming; neither does eternal punishment mean eternal punishing.

Lastly, shall we be directed to the highly figurative scenes at the close of the Apocalypse, where the smoke of Babylon's torment ascends for ever and ever, and a wild beast, a dragon, and a false prophet are tormented for ever? If these prophecies were to be understood literally, they would of course pre-suppose the everlasting life of the things to be everlastingly tormented. But as no one feels compelled to believe that an angel, for instance, will actually be seen "standing in the sun," neither are we compelled to believe that any living thing will actually be tormented for ever. What those visions do foreshadow has been discussed in many of our books and pamphlets. That they do not point to an eternal life of misery in any lake of fire literal or figurative, is abundantly evident from the last vision; where "new heavens and a new earth" appear, when "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things (including Babylon, the beast, the false prophet, the lake of fire, and 'whosoever was not found written in the book of life') have passed away," and God shall "make all things new." The lake of fire, and the smoking ruins of the doomed city, have not been transferred to some other planet, to defile its surface and darken its heavens; they have "passed away," he alone abiding who doeth the will of God. The words subsequently spoken by the angel to John (xxii. 10, 11) manifestly refer to the time when he received the prophecy, not to the final consummation; and seem to be susceptible of no rational interpretation except that given by Dean Alford—"The saying has solemn irony in it (as Ezek. iii. 27; and xx. 39; Matt. xxvi. 45); the time is so short that there is hardly room for change—the lesson conveyed in its depth being 'change while there is time.'"

Where then is there the slightest intimation in the whole Bible that this fond imagination of man's heart is pre-supposed? We

Digitized by Google

reply emphatically, Nowhere! There is not the ghost of a hint of it from Genesis to Revelation. Yet it is constantly spoken of as an undoubted fact; and one eminent writer has actually put in print that the evidence for it is "overwhelming!" What a despotic tyranny is exercised over the ablest minds by a fixed idea!

This, however, is only a fraction of the tremendous difficulty which has to be encountered by the assumption of man's necessary immortality. If Scripture is silent on that side, it is trumpet-tongued on the other. From beginning to end it positively labours to impress upon man that he is not an immortal, indestructible, but a dying, perishing creature; who, if he desires to inherit eternal life, must accept it as the free gift of God in Christ, and seek for it by patient continuance in well-doing. The alternatives of life and death, immortality and destruction, are incessantly put before us in every shape and form. Dogmatic assertions, warnings, promises, arguments, illustrations, and necessary inferences are massed together in such a way that it might have been thought impossible for any human being to misunderstand them. The very object of Christ's death is again and again declared to be, "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life:" yet Scripture, we are told, pre-supposes that man is absolutely imperishable, and must spend an everlasting life of some kind, whether he believes or not. It teaches that "whosoever doeth the will of God abideth for ever;" which pre-supposes that every one must abide for ever "either in weal or woe." It teaches that "if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever;" which pre-supposes that every man must live for ever, whether he eat of it or not,—pre-supposes the "unutterably solemn fact that each one of us in this cathedral must live on for ever and ever." It teaches that "the wages of sin is death;" which presupposes that man's spirit is essentially deathless, and that his body having been raised from its first temporary death, can incur no second death, but must "live eternally on in weal or in woe." It teaches that the "end" of impenitent sinners "is destruction," even "everlasting destruction;" that "like natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed," they "will utterly perish in their own corruption;" that they will be "cast forth as a branch and withered. . . . cast into the fire and burned,"—burnt up like "chaff" with unquenchable fire; that "a fiery indignation" will "devour" them; that they "shall be cut off," and "shall not be;" that "into smoke they shall consume away;" that they shall "lose their own souls," —"lose *themselves;*" all of which pre-supposes—what?—Why, something that would render it absolutely impossible for any one of these things ever to occur. In fact Scripture is tortured by this human philosophy into meaning the very reverse of what it says, nay of what it strains its voice to the utmost, in order to make men hear and understand.

We take our stand, therefore, on the plain consistent emphatic

Digitized by Google

teaching of the whole Bible from beginning to end; and reject that "tradition of men," which has obscured the glory of Christ, reduced to an unmeaning form the declaration that "God is Love," produced a frightful amount of infidelity, robbed the law of its terrors by making it threaten sinners with what they are sure will never be executed, incalculably weakened the saving power of the Gospel, and damaged the believer's whole spiritual constitution, by putting upon it an unnatural strain that God never intended it to bear.

SAMUEL MINTON.

REMARKS ON HEBREWS XIII. 10.

"We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the tabernacle."

THE ordinary explanation of this verse supposes it to draw a contrast between Christians on the one hand, and followers of the Mosaic ritual on the other; and some commentators say of it that, "owing to the recondite nature of the metaphors employed," it "involves no little difficulty." I am disposed to think that much of the reconditeness which it presents arises from its mistaken application, and take leave to suggest a simpler and (to me) more satisfactory explanation of the passage than the one commonly received. But first, let us look at the current explanation more in detail.

Dr. Bloomfield comments on the passage thus;—"We Christians have our sacrifice (viz., that of Christ by his atonement, shadowed out in the law, and typified in the Lord's Supper), of which those who rest their hopes of salvation in the ritual sacrifices of the Mosaic law (viz., Jews or Judaisers) have no right to partake; i.e., they are not *authorised* to eat, with any hope of benefit thereby, seeing that they rest their hopes of salvation on another and very different one." Another more popular commentary is to the same effect:—"We Christians have a higher and more valuable sacrifice than the Jewish offerings, of which they have no right to partake while they remain Jews."

Now it is important to notice that this manner of explaining the passage makes several departures from the natural and literal sense of its language.

Passing by as unquestionable the *metonymy* which employs "altar" to mean "the offering made upon it," we observe (1.) That the *eating* is taken as spiritual, meaning, as Dr. MacKnight expresses it, "the partaking of the pardon which Christ hath procured for sinners by that sacrifice." (2.) The phrase, "they who serve the tabernacle," is taken to include not alone *the priests* (the "ministers" of the tabernacle), to whom "it is properly applicable," as Bloomfield admits, but also the general mass of the people

Digitized by Google

on whose behalf they ministered. (3.) "Serving the tabernacle" is thus taken to mean, in a general sense, "resting hopes of salvation on ritual sacrifices." (4.) If we ask why these are said to have "no right" to partake of the Christian sacrifice, seeing such persons were very specially entreated by that preaching which "began at Jerusalem" to become partakers of its benefits, we are answered, by an addition to the text, that they have no right thereto *while they continue* to serve the tabernacle; or, adopting Dr. Bloomfield's supplement, "are not authorised to eat, *with any hope of benefit thereby.*"

It is thus seen that this explanation not only introduces "recondite metaphors," but even necessitates the making of tacit additions not only to the natural sense of the language, but even to the language itself. These may not be insuperable objections to the explanation in question, but they are at least a warrant for our inquiring whether there be no reasonable understanding of the passage that shall dispense with these departures from its natural sense—or, rather, whether the writer ever intended his words to have such reconditeness to those to whom they were penned.

The epistle was written to HEBREWS. What if, for the moment, the writer addressed them, not as *Christians*, but as *members of the Hebrew nation?* On such a supposition all mystery and metaphor disappear, and the verse becomes a plain and simple statement of a well-known *fact*. The tribe of Levi had been divinely called to "the service of the tabernacle"—observe the phrase (Numb. iii. 5-8; xviii. 1-8);—the chief charge and most sacred service being reserved for the family of Aaron. In return for the services thus rendered, the priests, and (if we may infer it from Deut. xviii. 1) even the auxiliary Levites, were allowed, among other "dues," to "eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire"—that is, as explained more in detail in other passages, certain portions of the sacrifices "reserved from the fire." (Numb. xviii. 9; Lev. vi., vii., x., &c.) This was the rule,—that of the animal sacrifices offered under the law, certain portions were set apart for the priests as their "reward for their service in the tabernacle of the congregation," and of these portions the priests were permitted, nay, even commanded (see Lev. x. 16-19) to eat. But to this rule there were some exceptions, the most notable of which is recorded in Lev. vi. 30, in these words:—"No sin-offering, WHEREOF ANY OF THE BLOOD IS BROUGHT INTO THE TABERNACLE of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten; it shall be BURNT in the fire." The instructions as to the *burning whole* of the bodies of such animals had already been given in chapter iv.: the matter is again referred to in chapter vi. 30, as an *exception* to the rights of the priests in the matter of eating the sacrifice which they offered.

Now, was it not to this exception that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews was referring when he said:—"We (Hebrews) have

Digitized by Google

an altar whereof they (the priests) who serve the tabernacle, have no right to eat (are expressly forbidden to eat); for the bodies of those beasts, whose BLOOD IS BROUGHT INTO THE SANCTUARY, by the high priest, for sin, are BURNED without the camp?" Every term is now natural and unstrained in its application, and the connection between verses 10 and 11 is obvious, which is more than can be affirmed of them under the other explanation.

The whole question hinges on the proper reference of the opening "We." Is there any violence in supposing, as I have suggested, that the writer was making for the moment a *national* reference? Surely nothing could be more natural in one writing to Hebrews, and, as is generally admitted, to those who were familiar with the ritual still carried on in the undestroyed temple at Jerusalem. A careful examination of the epistle will show, moreover, I venture to think, that, while the epistle was written specially for the better instruction of those Hebrews who had admitted the claims of Jesus of Nazareth, it was also intended as an appeal to the undecided or hostile portion of the nation. Was it not mainly of the latter that the writer was thinking when he uttered the warning of chapter xii. 25: "See that ye REFUSE not him that speaketh?" He speaks throughout as a Hebrew to Hebrews; why not so, in chapter xiii. 10, especially when by such a supposition the passage gains so much clearness?*

Nor is anything lost to the lesson, which the passage is meant to teach, by the understanding now offered. Verse 9, says; "It is a good thing that the heart be established with *grace*, not with *meats*," &c. A contrast is drawn between the inward strengthening derivable from spiritual truth, and the unprofitableness of any physical benefit derived from sacrificial meats. Then, referring to a well-known fact, the writer reminds them that, even in their Mosaic ritual, the superiority of the *spiritual* lessons of the sacrifices was shown. There were some sacrifices, and these the most solemn connected with the "purifying by blood," whose benefit was entirely one of *grace*, seeing even the priests were forbidden carnally to partake of the offerings. Again, just as in the old economy, this solemn sacrifice set forth the victim as an outcast to be carried beyond the camp, and burned to ashes—even so in the great antitypical sacrifice of Him whose blood was shed for the purification of the people. He suffered "without the gate," being "numbered among the transgressors," nay, even crucified *between* two thieves, as if himself a greater malefactor than they. "Let us, therefore, go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach." Let us Hebrews no longer stumble at the offence of the Cross, for,

* It may be worthy of consideration, besides, whether the Greek is not against the common understanding, which lays special emphasis on the "*we*" by contrast to "*they* who serve." The original has no such emphasis; "we have" is expressed without the personal pronoun.

Digitized by Google

"surely he was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; and the chastisement of our peace was upon him." Let us rather rejoice in his humiliation, taken as it is that he was the Great Deliverer of whom the prophets testified, for a time despised and "abhorred by the nation" (Isa. xlix. 7), but only for a time. Let us bear his reproach. It will pass away ere long. "Here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come"—that one "which hath foundations" firm and sure, "whose Builder and Maker is GOD."

Mount Florida, Glasgow. M. W. STRANG.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN.

BRIEF NOTES OF A PSYCHOLOGICAL ADDRESS.

THE answer to the question, Of how many constituent parts does man's nature consist? nowhere in the sacred Scriptures receives a more distinct reply than in 1 Thessalonians v. 23: "But may the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved whole without blame in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." And in the face of this explicit and emphatic statement of an inspired apostle, it seems almost impertinent to repeat it. Paul's answer unquestionably would have been,—Man is a tripartite being consisting of spirit, soul, and body.

Now it is worthy of observation that this is essentially the same analysis of human nature that is first given us in Gen. ii. 7:—

(1.) "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Here we have the *body*.

(2.) "And breathed into his nostrils the breath of the spirit of life." Here we have *spirit*.

(3.) "And man became a living *soul*."

This then is the ruling Hebrew conception of the nature of man in its complex unity, and we may confidently add that this threefold division of human nature is never throughout the Scriptures lost sight of.

Nevertheless we find, in point of fact, that the opinions of Christians are very much divided in reference to this question. Besides those who fully accept this tripartite division of man's nature, as expressed in Paul's words; there are:—

I. Those who—without any intention of using an invidious term—we may be allowed to call *Christian materialists*, and who hold that man is essentially simply a body—an organised material form—and that this body is to all intents and purposes *the man*: a living body being a man alive, and a dead body being a man dead. These brethren do not indeed deny that man has soul and spirit,

Digitized by Google

but they do deny, if we understand them aright, that man has either *a* soul or *a* spirit. They appear to deny, that is, to use Mr. Constable's language in the June RAINBOW, that either one or the other is "an entity." By "soul" they simply mean the animal life; and by "spirit," the spirit of God inspiring the body—that is to say the man—while it lives, and withdrawn when it dies.

II. There are those again,—and they comprehend the vast majority of theologians up to a recent date,—who hold that man is a *dichotomous* or twofold being, consisting of soul and body, or spirit and body: soul and spirit being regarded by them as synonymous terms, and used, it is said, interchangeably in Scripture. This analysis of man's nature appears, however, to rest mainly on one single passage of the New Testament, Matthew x. 28: "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." And it is based, we apprehend, on a superficial interpretation of this very solemn and important word of the Lord Jesus. If we bear in mind the fact that, as Bishop Ellicott has observed, the Scriptures never speak of the death or destruction of the *spirit* (πνεῦμα) of man, but only of his soul and body, we may see at once that if our Lord had said,—as perhaps we should at first sight have expected him to say,—"Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the *spirit:* but rather fear him which is able to destroy both *spirit* and body in hell;" he would have seemed to sanction what Scripture nowhere else teaches; spirit being ever regarded as indestructible and immortal. "God is spirit," though it does not follow that the converse is true and that spirit is God. But no finite being can exist as a purely unembodied spirit, for as such, it would be absorbed and lost in the Infinite spirit—"even as the minute quantity of air contained in a soap bubble is lost, when the bubble bursts," in the great atmosphere. By the soul, then, the finite human spirit is brought into relations with time and space: so that we can conceive of it as some*where* and some*when*. The soul then defines and gives form to the spirit, and thus, as Justin Martyr says, "As the body is the dwelling-place of the soul, so is the soul the dwelling-place of the spirit." Hence the soul ever carries the personality, and hence again the destruction of the soul involves the loss of the spirit as possessing any of the attributes of separate existence.

By the *body*, again, the *soul* (ψυχή) is brought into relation and contact with the external world of nature: without the body we should be cut off from this world of sight and sound, of beauty and horror, and when we lose the body in death we shall, in Scripture language, "sleep" to men though we still "live" to God, possessing a life indeed, but a life belonging to another and interior region. Shall we say *the ethereal?*

That we possess a *body*, then, we all know if we know anything, and therefore do not need to prove. And that we possess some-

Digitized by Google

thing other, something more than body—call it soul or spirit as we will—is also the almost universal and instinctive conviction of mankind, as well as the distinct and uniform teaching of Scripture. But when we proceed to maintain further that our immateriality is divisible into two parts—soul and spirit—our task becomes more difficult, Nevertheless this also is clearly the teaching of Scripture, as besides the passages already referred to, not to mention indirect proofs, we may direct attention to Hebrews iv. 12, where a distinction between the two is clearly drawn. "For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

If it be asked, In what does spirit differ essentially from soul, while we must confess our entire ignorance of the essential nature of either soul or spirit, or, we may add with equal truth, of matter also, it may be maintained that in all probability whereas spirit is absolutely immaterial in substance, soul is only comparatively so, as indeed we have already intimated.

Another very important fact which we learn from Scripture is, that men and angels only possess spirit; the lower animals having but soul and body. We are quite aware that by a school of somewhat servile critics this has been confidently denied. It is so by Mr. Constable who expresses himself somewhat dogmatically on the point: "If we accept the positive declarations of Scripture upon this point there will be no difficulty, for Scripture does positively declare that beasts have 'spirit' as much as man, and that this spirit in both is one and the same. And this is told us in Scripture fully as often as we could reasonably expect."* And even Mr. White says, "If man possesses a *ruach* (spirit) so do they. 'Who knoweth the *spirit* of a beast that goeth downwards?' 'They have all one *ruach*.' (Eccl. iii. 19, 21; Psa. civ. 29, 30. *Heb.*)"† The mistake of these writers, as we regard it, arises however from their failing to distinguish accurately between what we will call the *physical* and the *psychological* use of the Hebrew word. The primary meaning of *ruach* is simply air in motion, like the Greek πνεῦμα. Hence the most primitive idea of the word is *wind*, and secondly, *breath*, since by the act of breathing an animal puts the air in motion. In both these senses *ruach* is repeatedly used in Scripture, as e.g., Numb. xi. 31, "The *wind* (*ruach*) brought quails from the sea:" Job xvii. 1, "My *breath* (*ruach*) is corrupt;" and Eccl. iii. 19, "Yea, they all have one *breath* (*ruach*)." Psa. civ. 29, "Thou takest away their *breath* (*ruach*), they die." Now of course in this *physical* sense of breath the word is used in reference to men and animals alike. Not so, however, in its higher psychological sense, as in

* "*Hades*," second edition, p. 29.
† "*Life in Christ*," second edition, p. 108.

Digitized by Google

Job. xxxii. 8: "But there is a spirit (*ruach*) in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." (With which compare Isa. xxxi. 3, "Their horses are flesh and not spirit.") In this psychological sense the use of the word *ruach* is strictly confined in Scripture to God, angels, and men.*

Man is differentiated then from the angel, on the one hand, as possessing *body*, and from the mere animal, on the other, by the higher attribute of *spirit*. His nature, therefore, is the most comprehensive of all creaturely existences and relates him to all the three great concentric spheres of God's universe.

A very humble and familiar, but not inapt illustration of the tripartite nature of man may we think be found in a lady's scent-bottle. This we know has frequently an outer case of leather or other material, which may be taken to represent the body. We remove this, and within it we find the bottle itself, which is a vessel of crystal beautiful in form and ornamentation; let this answer to the soul. Within the bottle again is the volatile odoriferous essence, which if not enclosed therein would be lost and dissipated, a singu-

* There is one apparent exception to this rule, Eccl. iii. 21, "Who knoweth whether the spirit of man goeth upward, or the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" On this passage that very able Hebrew scholar, Prof. George Bush, has the following note: "This is usually interpreted of the *vital spirit* of man and beasts, of which the one goes at death upwards, or 'returns to God who gave it,' while the other goes downwards to the earth, i.e., perishes. But we deem it well worthy of question whether the import be not simply, that there is, to the eye of sense, no difference between the destiny of man, whose spirit here on earth *goes* or *aspires* upwards, and that of the beast, whose spirit, or ruling instinct, *tends* or *grovels* downwards to the earth as its appropriate goal. In view of the fact that they both die and are turned to dust alike, who can discriminate between the final allotment of a being whose nature *soars to heaven*, and one whose nature *gravitates to earth?* We do not confidently affirm this to be the true sense, but we think it one entitled to attention. As there is no other instance in which רוּחַ is predicated of a beast, it seems reasonable to conclude that it is here used in a tropical sense to indicate the *indoles*, or *genius*, of the beast in opposition to that of the man. It is said, indeed (ver. 19), that all have one *breath* (רוּחַ), but in this case the allusion is undoubtedly to the *breath of the nostrils*, whereas in verse 21 the term points rather, if we mistake not, to the inner predominant characteristic of a rational nature. However this may be, we are by no means satisfied that the passage, on a fair construction, is designed to teach that brute beasts are possessed of that principle which in man is indicated by the word *spirit*. In like manner though the term *heart* is not usually applied as a designation of any part of the nature of a beast, yet in Dan. iv. 16, we find it employed in that reference, but evidently in a metaphorical sense, 'Let his *heart* be changed from man's, and let a *beast's heart* be given him.' A *beast's spirit* is to be understood in the same way."—*The Soul*, pp. 77, 78.

At all events Ecclesiastes being a book of doubtful inspiration, unknown authorship, and dramatic character, the incidental use of the word in a single passage forms a very insufficient ground on which to rest an important psychological conclusion, and must not be allowed to set aside the general usage of Scripture.

Digitized by Google

larly accurate representation of the spirit. For this illustration, at which the reader may feel disposed to smile, we find some sanction in the fact that in Hebrew smelling-bottles (*botai hanephesh*) literally mean "houses of the soul." The term occurs once only in Scripture, Isa. iii. 20, where however in our English version it is curiously mistranslated "tablets."

In conclusion we would say, let no regard for system or theory induce us to undervalue or ignore the spiritual element—the divine basis so to speak—of our nature. Let us remember that "God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" and let us pray that the outgoings of our human spirits towards "the Father of spirits" may be acceptable before him, even as "the odour of a sweet smell."

* AN OLD STUDENT.

ROOM IN THE CROSS.

LORD! I am bringing unto Thee
My weakness,—my infirmity:
Infirmity oft veils this cross;
And weakness whispers sin and loss.

My sin I know should hang in sight;
But over it, thy love and might:
The Spirit does not speak of loss
To sinners looking at the cross.

Come all ye weary ones, draw nigh;
There yet is room!—is Mercy's cry;—
Room near the cross!—there! there *I'll* lie
Shouting I'm safe! there's Jesus by!

There's Jesus by!—enough for me!
Enough through all eternity:
For who could dream of any loss,
With Jesus hanging on the cross.

With Jesus hanging on the cross,
I rise triumphant over loss;
With Jesus lying in the grave,
My faith still cries,—He'll rise to save!

And now that Jesus is in heaven,
Who dares to say I'm unforgiven?
One doubt hung on his blood-stained cross,
Would bring Him shame—might bring me loss.

H. BURNETT.

Digitized by Google

A FEW WORDS ON "LIFE IN CHRIST."

I DO not know whether I represent *a class*, but I think it possible that I may do so. The supposition that this may be the case must be my apology for wishing to state in the RAINBOW, as briefly and clearly as I can, how this subject, now so much discussed, presents itself to my own mind,—after reading at least a great part of what has been written concerning it.

I am satisfied that nothing can be found in Scripture to support the ordinary opinion that man, by creation, is naturally and necessarily immortal.

I am equally convinced that Scripture everywhere sanctions the conclusion that it is only by virtue of their relationship to the Redeemer that the regenerate enjoy eternal life.

I am no less sure that the Divine record expressly declares that *some*—the irreclaimably wicked,—shall at length be utterly destroyed in the lake of fire, which is the second death.

The point on which I differ from Mr. White and his followers (if I understand them aright) relates simply to the lot of the great human family,—the myriads of the race, who cannot, so far as I see, be honestly classed either with the renewed, or with the active opposers of God and righteousness.

Mr. Minton, I perceive, regards this aspect of the question as merely "a side issue," which may be left for determination in the future. Mr. White speaks, although with a good deal of uncertainty, of many being possibly regenerated respecting whom we know nothing at present.* Some others I find take refuge in the hope, if it be nothing more, of an extended recovery of the lost after the resurrection. *All these*, of course hold, and so far I agree with them all, that it is impossible to sustain from Scripture the old doctrine of the eternal torment of every individual who is not born again while dwelling upon the earth.

But I submit, the doctrine of destruction, or, as it is sometimes called, of annihilation, will never be extensively received, so long as it is supposed to imply *the blotting out of existence for ever* of all who leave this world in ignorance, whether voluntary or otherwise, of Christ and his salvation. This view debases man as much as the popular notion about his immortality unduly exalts him. It brings him down to the level of the brutes that perish, while it

---

* It is refreshing to meet from the pen of an orthodox Scottish divine, Dr. Marcus Dodds, such words as these: "Salvation is a resemblance to Christ; it is the possession of the spirit of Christ; and if the fruits of that spirit are found in the life of those who have known nothing of the historical Christ, we should welcome the idea thus suggested, that apart from this knowledge, our Lord may have found means of communicating his spirit to some."—"*Mohammed, Buddha, and Christ*," p. 227.—W. M.

Digitized by Google

leaves him in possession of a responsibility that is truly fearful. Originally made in the image of God, appointed ruler of the inferior creation, and endowed with faculties to which mere animals can lay no claim, it seems impossible to suppose that men can perish as the brutes do; that while the subject of resurrection and of future judgment, man has connected therewith *no extended existence;* no means of knowing God beyond such as are furnished within the limits of this mortal life; no future big with promise of a *possible* elevation during the ages.

To me, the settlement of this question, so far at least as it is capable of solution, is no side issue, but an essential element in the obtaining of right views regarding future retribution.

I write in no unfriendly spirit,—for I think we ought to feel ourselves greatly indebted to men, who, like Mr. Edward White, have devoted the best part of their lives to searching after truth,—but simply because I think the view he and his friends advocate cannot advance, so long as it is presented as *a bare affirmation* that all life is in Christ, an assertion that very few, I think, would deny; and so long as it involves an implication, to which I think very few will assent, that life in the Living One is limited to the renewed, who are the merest fragment of mankind; that consequently all that is written about Christ being the Saviour of *the world* is unreal and delusive; a notion which, whether springing out of ultra-Calvinism, or out of anything else, is heart-hardening and promotive of spiritual pride.

Perhaps I may be permitted to add, that the doctrine in question as now commonly brought before the Christian world, has too much the appearance of an abstract speculation. I have heard many persons say they are tired of hearing about it, because *it does not lead anywhere.* They regard it as put forward simply as the alternative of *eternal torment,* and, so far, they are favourably disposed towards it. But this is a very limited view of the matter, and one that Mr. White emphatically disclaims.

What the human heart wants, is more *rest* in relation to the future of the race; what it needs is a doctrine more in accordance with the revealed love of God to man than is yet commonly preached; and it must be a doctrine, not like that of universalism, which is unsupported by Scripture and inconsistent with human freedom, but one that shall leave untouched all existing motives to faith and repentance, and shall harmonise the spiritual exaltation of *the few* and the obviously low moral state of *the many,* by showing that this distinction is intended for the ultimate benefit of of every creature who, however darkly and feebly, desires to please God.

Looking at the matter thus, what can I do but subscribe myself only

* AN INQUIRER?

Digitized by Google

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

ARTICLE V.—Conclusion.

IN this the concluding article of the series, we will first of all briefly review the ground we have gone over, and then raise the question whether the conclusions we seem desirous to adopt respecting these difficult portions of the inspired record are not likewise applicable, though in an inferior degree, to the whole canon of Scripture.

At the outset we drew attention to the situation of David; to his Bible, his times, his history: to the situation of Israel; the spirit of the dispensation under which they lived, the special work committed them to do, the reflex action of bloody rites and bloody extermination, We strove to indicate some salient points in David's character, and left the reader to judge whether the imprecatory Psalms were not the fit and natural utterances of a man whose will was in harmony with the dispensation under which he lived, but who exceeded in blood and therefore could not build the temple. We found it easy to do justice to the glory and beauty of his heavenly inspiration, to his clear vision of divine sanctions, to the massive proportions of his faith, to the humble duty with which he bore his anointing, to his whole-souled love of God, and tender sensitiveness to the blame of God. Oh! sweet singer of Israel, let us in these things follow thee!

We next considered the worth of the objection, that David having been selected to occupy so conspicuous a place as a type of Christ, we are left no alternative but to accept all his utterances as in the fullest sense divine,—true revelations of the spirit in which God regards the world at large, and the manner in which he will deal with *his* enemies.

We suggested, in contradiction of this idea, the extreme likelihood that in the selection of the types of Christ the wayward preferences of God, if we dare so call them, as in the cases of Ephraim and Jacob, would again confound human expectations—that it is in the nature of a character of unchallengeable excellence to be careless of the misconceptions of the world; and in the choice of associates to be disposed rather to cast its shield over those whose root is sound although their flower has sometimes fallen, than fall in with current but shallow estimates of what is reputable in one's connections.

We said it became him who was set forth to be a propitiation for the sins of the world to lay hold on men of alpine religious character, seamed with gulfs of yawning crime, and link them to his grand career; that it might be a standing encouragement to sinners in all ages to connect themselves with him who can serenely smile at misconception and say, "Look and see if there be any flaw in me, because of my associates!" That consequently David's typical relationship ought not to alter the standpoint from which we regard specific elements in his character, or disallow our belief in a human element mingling largely with his inspiration.

We further considered what was to be understood of David's "enemies," the subjects of his perpetual anethema, and we came to the conclusion that it outstretched probability to suppose that they were all enemies of God, seeing how large a part circumstance had in deter-

Digitized by Google

mining their temporary relationship to David, and that the Divine gift of reading and knowing of a truth what is in man, was clearly not his.

But we also said that without doubt there was a sense in which the imprecatory Psalms were testimonies and revelations of the Divine character and purposes. They stand as witness to the verity of God's anger towards evil doers and hatred of sin—the true enemies—the lovers of sin and rejectors of Christ, as known to God alone—and to the Divine purpose to put away sin and sinners from his universe: to destroy the Devil and all his works. In this light, these Psalms may be read with reverential awe and attentive ear; and they may also be read with profit as Arnold read them, as applicable to a man's spiritual foes who compass him on every side, and to the arch-enemy himself.

We next contrasted the spirit of the imprecatory Psalms with that of the New Testament, where the treatment of enemies is the subject; and we found them diametrically opposed; we could not however hesitate to rest assured that the later dispensation was a fuller and completer revelation of the Divine mind than the earlier, and that the world is called upon to walk in the light last given to it, and to discern God in Christ rather than in David.

We found that the spirit of the imprecatory Psalms met the Jews of David's day upon their own spiritual level and was verifiable by their own spiritual consciousness; but that it seemed more than probable that many and many a heart in after generations felt it had outgrown the economy under which it was placed and the partial revelation made in the Scriptures of their day, and inwardly and often sighed for a God who came closer to the conception of their souls. We know now how divinely true was the dissatisfaction which they felt, how verifiable in Christ himself was the conception of a God which they inwardly conceived in spite of the spirit of the law and the language of their books of appeal. So that when he came at last, Simeon—last in the line of these far-sighted ones—spoke for them all, when he said: "Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

We next asked aid from the commentators. We found that Bishop Horne's system of turning the imprecations into predictions could not grammatically be sustained. Selecting Delitzsch and Perowne as most worthy of lengthened quotation we found them both agreed in deciding that the language of these Psalms was inappropriate upon the lips of Christians, because controverted by the spirit of the New Testament, which, although the Old Testament contained glimpses of its light, differs in the superior glory of its moral teaching as day from night. We found too that both commentators accounted for David's unqualified curses by reminding us that he was ignorant of the horrible discoveries made to the world by the advent of Christ. None of the terrors of the law could convey to David's mind an adequate conception of the frightful vengeance of the Father of Jesus Christ. Had he known that Jesus came into the world not only to do the will of God in giving himself for us all, but also to cast a snare upon the face of the earth so that the greater multitude might be dragged to the bottomless pit, he would have paused, and at sight of the yawning and ever-burning gulf, his words of wrath had died upon his open lips.

Digitized by Google

This is the commentators' reading of the glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people.

We found that "T. W.," the well-known contributor to this periodical threw more light upon the subject than either of the writers we have named. The maledictions of the Psalms were outdone in the law and the prophets; and they could only be understood of legal liability and temporal infliction without excluding the idea of Gospel intervention and future everlasting salvation.

This led us into some bright and comforting considerations, as following St. Paul we argued from the number of the guilty, the vicariously suffering, and the lost, to the number of the forgiven, compensated, and saved.

We can now safely leave the reader to form his own conclusions respecting the degree in which these imprecatory Psalms are to be regarded as reflecting upon us the character and designs of God.

We now invite him to remember in how many various ways we suggested analogies between the partial and defective, because progressive revelation granted to the church in its different stages, and the position of the church of the present day in relation to its canon of Scripture. It will be remembered that we conceived of the successive dispensations as successive unveilings, revealing more and more of the Divine glory; not indeed contemporaneously with preparation to receive them, but answering long preceding thirst and prayerful expectation. We drew attention, as again in the summary just given, to the fact that what, in the imprecatory Psalms, gave voice to the religious sentiment of David's day, no longer corresponds to the voice within ourselves. That the level of our spiritual attainment, under Gospel light, is higher, and our spiritual consciousness irresponsive, nay contradictory to the thought of that darker day; which consideration suggests an explanation of similar experiences felt by Christians in regard to portions of the New Testament itself; portions which seem irreconcilable with its general tenor and pervading character, and which are certainly painfully perplexing and out of harmony with the religious consciousness of very many of its devoted students.

May it not be that we too have, under the gracious leading of the Spirit, been led to anticipate and pray for another word, and even that not a last one, from our Father which is in heaven? Is the reader startled by the suggestion? But why should he be so? Had Abraham any intimation given to him of a Bible to come out in parts at intervals of centuries? Is there any formal prediction in the Old Testament Scriptures of the additional inspired writers which constitute the New?

Let the reader consider that instalments of the revelation as we now possess it have been always sudden, separated, longed-for, expected as to the fact, but not expected as to the time. The historical parallel between the situation of the church to-day and that of the Jews immediately prior to the first advent is almost complete. The last of the prophets had spoken, the age of miracles had ceased. The teachers of the people taught them that the consummation of all that the prophets had spoken lay in the coming of the Messiah. He would come not to add to the external revelation but to fulfil it. Supply the reign of the Spirit and substitute the Second for the First Advent, and the church is

Digitized by Google

now where it was in the interval between Malachi and John the Baptist.

This is the argument from analogy. Another argument is furnished by a consideration of the contents of the Book—its unfulfilled predictions. Christ being the great theme which connects the whole, we discern that the predictions respecting his first coming have alone received elucidation from their historical fulfilment, while those respecting his Second Advent are to us as full of difficulty and mystery, and as liable to doubtful interpretation, as were those which to the carnal minds of the Jews supplied reasons for rejecting the claims of the Prophet of Nazareth. Fully a fifth of the body of Scripture consists of writings which, be it to their blame or not, are by common consent allowed by Christian people to be almost useless for family instruction, inapplicable to public exhortation, of very secondary value in the closet, and fit only to be read with profit by students of prophecy, who by their varied and conflicting interpretations sufficiently testify that the master-key is wanting to them all.

We see in some mysterious way that the far past is in the Divine design intimately connected with the far future; that the buried and forgotten cities and dynasties that have no interest for us now, are reserved in prophecy for future dealing in connection with the second coming of the King of kings. Brilliant light has been shed upon what is fact and what figure in all that was spoken of the First Advent, by the event itself and by the evangelists and apostles. We feel as respects the sayings concerning the Second Advent and the resurrection of old world powers, that we wander in the dark without the key which an ulterior revelation of fact and exposition alone can supply.

To us the Scriptures appear like the buildings of a college we have seen, which was purposely erected so as to receive additions at a future date. One end of the structure bearing unmistakable evidence of want of finish and having projections to furnish attachment to the new portion which it is designed and intended shall be added at a date not named. Symmetry, unity, completion are evidently wanting to what we have, as well as elucidation. The further revelation we may with reason expect will be a development as well as an addition, fruit added to the blossom which has sprouted from the tree of Genesis,—an addition made in another age of miracle and supernatural manifestation whose light from heaven shall smite the mouths of these sphinx-like prophets murmuring in the desert and make their music clear.

Now there is not one word in Scripture to contradict this expectation. But while we may be thus sure of the law of intermittent progress observable in the communicating of a Divine revelation to men, we diverge from our main argument for a moment to notice that it is impossible for us to perceive *why* the revelation should be so given. We wax very philosophical in attempting to expound and make clear a development of the education of the race and a preparatory work of civilisation contemporaneous with and essential to the reception of the instalments of the Word. But so far as we can see had the story of the cross and the resurrection been completed before the flood, and had the Spirit as he now operates in the world been shed abroad before the conquest of Canaan, individuals among the doomed tribes would have

Digitized by Google

become new creatures in Christ Jesus just as in the present day fragments of the Gospel disconnected from the law, read in the Island of Madagascar and preached to Caffres, Zulus, Maories, and Fijians make new creatures of savages who know nothing of a previous dispensation or of a preparatory civilisation bringing them like school-masters to Christ.

We return now to the consideration of further reasons for the expectation of a new revelation, and we deem one of the strongest to lie in the existing evidence of a new state of the religious consciousness scarcely known to the apostles even, but evidently the result of the cumulative teaching of the Spirit in the church since the days of the apostles.

This new state of the religious consciousness removes us from sympathy with the imprecatory Psalms, claims our admiration of the Gospel above the law, and has led us, without literal direction, to give effect to the principles of the Gospel; compelling us to abolish slavery, to deprecate war, to institute palliations for its miseries, to mission the heathen, to struggle in a thousand ways to elevate the masses, to grant equal laws, to prevent cruelty to animals, to make mercy a duty, and to worship Love as a God. Known under various names as the spirit of humanity, of philanthropy, of Christianity, we will call it the *consciousness of common justice*—and this word "common" we use in the double sense of both universal and simple or essential. It is on account of the strength and the prevalence of this sentiment of common justice that the level of our spiritual consciousness is so much higher than that of David's contemporaries, and higher even than the orthodox interpretations given to New Testament revelations. The spirit within us appears often to clash with the letter, the word given requires further explanation from the Master who spake it; meanwhile it is his own spirit whispers "Peace," and bids us rely that common justice is Divine.

The general advance in the level of the religious consciousness, beyond what was current in the primitive church, beyond apparently what was felt by the apostles themselves, or if felt was not expressed, this we take to be another reason for expecting that further light suited to the altered powers of vision will certainly be vouchsafed. And by the clearer light of the later revelation communicating the complementary chapters which will give unity and meaning to the whole, it may be given future ages to discern how, just as we now decide with certainty that a human element mingled largely in the inspired compositions of David, so the writers of the New Testament, unable completely to obliterate the consequences of their Jewish training, and avowedly speaking sometimes without Divine authority, did unconciously adulterate their inspiration with human misconceptions.

Meanwhile, and until such further revelation has been given, let not the Christian reader scruple to rely upon the sacred and sanctifying convictions of the Holy Spirit, even when they *seem* to be contradicted by the letter of the Word. We reserve for another opportunity a fuller exposition and defence of our views of the function of the "Spirit" as interpreter of the Word; of the spheres in which "logic, grammar, and exegesis" must decide without appeal and of the sphere in which it is the duty and privilege of the individual Christian to recognise and

Digitized by Google

appropriate the intimations of the Supreme Interpreter, Suffice it to say here that in this interval between the last and the next supernatural revelation the Spirit pre-eminently exercises his promised function of the Comforter. "I will not leave you comfortless," said the Saviour to his sorrowing disciples, "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth, who shall teach you all things, and show you things to come." And surely this function of the Holy Spirit is one especially precious and necessary to us in this day; for if the state of the best part of the invisible church can be truly described in one word, it is in that of being "comfortless." Comfortless by reason of its extended knowledge of the laws of the universe; and of the condition of all the sentient creation of which man is the chief. Comfortless by reason of the expansion of its sympathies and the impossibility of happiness continuing unshaded by sadness when it is known to stand in contrast with the condition of the greater number. Comfortless by reason of the renewal of God's image in the heart of man, by the operation of the Comforter himself, making the soul which now participates in the sufferings of Christ a mirror for the reflection of all other known sufferings: not however a mirror of hard and insensible metal incapable of holding its reflections, but fatally dowered with the involuntary power of imparting permanence to its impressions. Comfortless by reason of the relentless rushing in of news upon this sensitive mirror, from all quarters of the globe, burdening the finite spirit with too large a portion of the sorrow of God, who knows it all, but whose present sorrow, like the non-luminous rays in the sunbeam, detracts nothing from the light of his blessedness, because nothing from the certainty of the world's broad day. Comfortless by reason of the silence in heaven and earth, when men are beheld in flocks attempting to dig up by the roots that Tree of Life —the one blessed treasure for the healing of the nations—whose roots are wrapped round the throne of God and the sap of whose branches is the blood of Christ. Comfortless by reason of the increasing distinctness with which difficulties and contradictions are perceived in the contents of Holy Writ and the yearning that exists in the hearts of the most reverential students of Scripture for a reconciliation between doctrines that are thought to have a literal basis in the Word and impressions of the Divine character that they *know* to be light from heaven. It was in gracious provision for this state of the church, inevitably supervening in the period of her spiritual progress from the First to the Second Advent, that the Spirit was foretold as the "Comforter" to come; sent down from "the Father of mercies and the God of all consolation" that as "the sufferings of (the world) abound in us, so our consolation also might abound by Christ."

Postscript.—At the conclusion of this series of papers it is fitting that notice should be taken of the strictures to which they have been subjected at the hands of Mr. M. W. Strang in a letter that appeared in the March number; and again in an extract from a letter to the Editor published in July.

I am personally obliged to Mr. Strang for awakening an interest in the discussion by adducing the testimony of Hebrew scholars in favour

Digitized by Google

of a different rendering of 1 Kings ii. 9, to that which my comments implicitly sanctioned; but he is mistaken if he supposes that I had not considered with the anxiety of one not himself a Hebrew scholar, and with the care and absence of prejudice involved in any real pursuit of truth, all that I could find explanatory of the difficult passages in David's career and writings before presuming to write about them.

It would have been easy to have extended the articles to double their length had I given quotations from the authorities consulted and my reasons for assent or dissent. I confined myself to giving results only, feeling the imperative duty of being brief in an age when so many have so much to say.

Dr. Kennicott's rendering I had carefully pondered, but was unable conscientiously to agree with it. The case is briefly this:—

"It is not uncommon in the Hebrew language to omit the negative in the second part of a sentence, and to consider it as repeated, when it has been once expressed and is followed by the connecting particle." The translators of the English version had consequently frequently to supply the negative, as for example, "For the needy shall not always be forgotten: the expectation of the poor shall (not) perish for ever." (Psa. viii. 18.)

Parkhurst puts it in another way. He considers that although the most common meaning of the connective particle ו (*vau*) is simply "and" or "but," yet there resides in it the power to carry the force of a preceding negative into the following clause. This power, be it understood is not constantly but only incidentally recognised in the use made of this particle by the Hebrew writers; in other words, its employment does not *demand* the transference of a preceding negative to the following clause but only suggests it.

In order to establish a connection between the first and the last clause of the 9th verse of 1 Kings ii., and so enable the connective particle to suggest a repetition of the negative, it is maintained that the middle of the verse must be understood parenthetically. Let us omit it altogether, and the English version will read: "Now therefore hold him not guiltless, but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood." This is clear and logical. The rendering of Parkhurst with the same clause omitted reads: "Now therefore hold him not guiltless, neither bring down his grey hairs with blood to the grave." This if not exclusively a *non-sequitur* is too subtle to be probable. Kennicott's is better: he simply imports a negative without incorporating it with the connective particle. "Now therefore, hold him not guiltless, but bring not down his hoary head to the grave with blood." This, too, is clear and logical, and deriving apparent support from the manner in which Solomon dealt with Shimei in the first instance, the temptation is strong to accept it at once, without further inquiry, and rejoice in the relief which it affords.

It is true that the whole deliverance is due to an hypothesis,—to the supposition that a negative was intended when it was not expressed; and therefore demands the most rigid inquiry before expressing it in a translation. Why not, however, "rest and be thankful" even though in the acquittal of David, we accuse the letter of Scripture of painful ambiguity and the Authorised Version of error?

The true searcher after truth cannot thus palter with his conscience.

Digitized by Google

Further inquiry is demanded, and then the reader is struck by the parallelism between the injunction David gave respecting Joab and that given respecting Shimei, Of Joab he said: "Do therefore according to thy wisdom, and let not his hoar head go down to the grave in peace." Of Shimei, he said: "Now therefore hold him not guiltless; for thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him: but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood." It is in the highest degree artificial and improbable to import into the above directions a contrast instead of an identity of intention, and the reference to Solomon's wisdom is very unpleasant in such a connection. Certainly it was eminently "wise" (in a serpentine sense) for the accomplishment of his sinister design, instead of putting Shimei under restraint, to leave him absolutely free, only exacting an oath that he should not leave Jerusalem. We are not told that the oath was ever renewed, and the old sinner seems to have considered its restriction to have been tacitly relaxed when, leaving Jerusalem with no other evil intent than to recover some runaway chattels, he returned without misgiving to the city of the king. But Solomon was timely informed of the success of his plans, and in the trap which he set and in his treatment of the entrapped we see too clearly that he understood far better than Parkhurst or Kennicott what David really intended.

Much as we should like to be relieved by any new reading that could commend itself as true, we must honestly say what has been suggested wholly fails to carry conviction to our own mind, and we so decided before our first article was written.

Now we must notice Mr. Strang's remark in the July number of the RAINBOW. "By the way, I really wish Mr. Deacon would take a hint about David's relation to the 109th Psalm. It is too bad to continue to blame him for our own blunders."

I am left to conjecture that what is here alluded to is one or both of the following presumptions respecting the import of this Psalm.

The first I will consider in connection with the character of the Psalm as Messianic. It is supposed that the inspiration of God compelled David, in his typical and prophetic character to give utterance to language which he, in his human character would have hesitated to apply to his enemies. But we are immediately met by the insuperable difficulty that Christ's attitude to his enemies was precisely the opposite. It was no prophecy of Christ's prayer respecting his betrayers and murderers; for where David curses, Christ blesses. It cannot possibly be prophetic of God's judgments upon Christ's enemies, because not only is it simply a prayer of David to God, but to decide that the utterance of David's petition involved its acceptance and answer on God's part, would carry with it the denial of Christ's prayer absolutely; so that Christ in his office as an Intercessor, in the very first use of his power, plucked from the cross, is made wholly to fail; his prayer being rendered of no effect, by reason of the prior petition of David of a wholly opposite character.

The other hypothesis is that we have here, from the sixth to the end of the nineteenth verse, not David cursing his enemies, but his enemies cursing him; and it is to this solution—suggested by him in the February number—that Mr. Strang perhaps more particularly refers. This inter-

Digitized by Google

pretation, however, seems to us to require, as Mr. Ruskin would say, a "steam crane" for its accomplishment, and something very like "blundering" in any one suggesting it.

It is sufficient to point to Acts i. 20, where the last clause of verse 8 —which on the supposition is the language of Christ's enemies concerning Christ—is quoted as a word of inspiration concerning Judas!

Let me at once avow my belief that David was a prophet, that he was a type of Christ, that he did as a prophet predict woe upon God's enemies, largely mingling therewith human passion and imperfection, and the ignorant errors of his age. But to me the sublimity of the Psalms in which his typical relationship to Christ appears, lies in the fact of the infinite disparity between the human and the divine,—the transcending superiority of the Antitype to the type,—a superiority so great as to manifest itself in absolute collision and contrast when the temper of mind cherished towards their enemies is respectively exhibited. Can anything more vicious in principle and consequences be imagined than a determination to equivocate over and condone the moral delinquencies of any character who is represented in the Scriptures as a type of Incarnate Deity? For an explanation of their faults we are referred to the Deity whom they prefigured. The human is made the measure of the Divine, and what is inhuman is declared to be superhuman. The darkness of sinful beings is maintained to be a revelation of him in whom is no darkness at all.

Whereas how true it really is, that by far the broadest surfaces of contact between type and antitype are to be found on the official side, and on the moral side very often angular divergence. Types of Christ are thrown upon the sands of time, like fragments of the cliff upon the shore: true types are they of the towering rock, being indeed fallen parts of it—true types in everything but *height*. Finally, we beg the reader to note the use made of 69th Psalm vv. 22, 23, in Rom. xi., from which we see that St. Paul indignantly repudiates the irrecoverable condemnation of the enemies of Christ: "Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid!" * HENRY DEACON.

CHERUBIC PHENOMENA.

BY WILLIAM MORRIS, M.D.

Preliminary Observations.

"THE Cherubim" are first mentioned in the record of man's expulsion from the Garden of Eden. As artistic symbols, they were the heraldic supporters of the throne of Jehovah in the holy of holies of the Mosaic Tabernacle. As phenomena they were present in the visions of Ezekiel; and in the prophetic drama shown in vision to John on the Isle of Patmos. And here a question of profound interest arises, touching their true significance and divine intent. They are mentioned and shown in manifest relation to the moral government of God. What, therefore, is the specific nature of their relation to the divine government over the human race, over the nation of Israel, and over the principalities

Digitized by Google

and powers of the world? This threefold question we will endeavour to answer as we proceed.

But, in the first place, it must be observed that, the symbols and similitudes of Holy Scripture are not, in any instance, or in any respect arbitrary in their origin or conception. They are founded in the constitution and the particulars of terrestrial nature; and in the economic and historic facts of the sacred record; the *seeming* exception being observed in composite or preternatural forms. And if the truth of this be ignored, or in any way disregarded, we are without any certain guide to an understanding of those symbols and similitudes, as to their bases and intents in the scheme of divine revelation; and each is left to the bent of his own fancy, and the bias of his own preconceived opinions.

Our present theme is "the Cherubim:" and our first concern is with the original phrase as found in the Hebrew Scriptures, and which—without the Masoretic points—reads thus: *ha-ke-rabeem*, and its most probable, primary meaning is, *the likeness of the heads*. The initial letter, *caph*, denotes some kind of similarity or likeness; and the adjective, *rab*, represents the idea of *great*, *chief*, or *head:* and the cherubic phenomena bore a likeness to an eagle, a bull, a lion, and a man: and these four are the heads or chiefs of the four grand divisions or orders of terrestrial creatures. Hence, the question which claims immediate attention is this: Can the basis or reason for these cherubic forms or characteristics be discerned in the constitution and the particulars of terrestrial nature? And in order to a reply to this question we must again notice the manifest relation of the cherubim to the divine government, and must also observe that the specific nature of that relation is not legislative, but is *executive*. In other words, the cherubim represent ideas of the governmental attributes of the Supreme Ruler, with a special reference to the government of this world.

That the cherubic forms were adapted to symbolise executive ideas is shown through a corrected reading of a part of the Mosaic record of the creation; "And on the sixth day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created TO MAKE." This last word, in the original, is the infinitive of the term *hah-sah*, and means to make. It denotes the procreative—and thus the executive—design of God in the creation of the living creatures upon earth. The original pairs were constituted the executive of the will of their Creator, for the increase and continuance of their several orders and genera: and the heads of the four grand divisions or orders—the eagle, the bull, the lion, and the man—supply the cherubic forms. And in sacred and symbolic numeration, *four* is the number for executive completeness, even as *three** is the number for constitutional complete-

* The Godhead is the Unity of Three constituent persons—the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The solar light is a unity of three constituent principles—the actinic, the luminiferous, and the calorific. The regenerated man is a unity of three—the spirit, and the soul, and the body. And the universe is a community of three; that is, in the intimated order of creation, consisting of matter, force, and life; and in the manifest order of organic progression, consisting of life, force, and matter.

Digitized by Google

ness; and these numbers combined are seven, which is the number for perfectness, and for confirmation; the Hebrew word for seven being radically the same as that which represents the idea of an oath. And if further illustration may be desired, it is found in the mnuber twelve—the four multiplied by the three; and in the number twelve the idea of executiveness is intensified, and is exemplified in the case of the twelve patriarchs, the twelve tribes of Israel, and the twelve apostles of The Christ.

First Section.

The Cherubim in the Garden of Eden.

"And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever;—therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

It is requisite that the inspired record, which is thus translated, should be reconsidered. The word rendered "placed," in the clause, "and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden," is the future of the Hebrew word *shah-cheen (in hiphil)*, and should read, he caused to dwell or entabernacled the cherubim, etc. And the words literally rendered a "flaming sword," represent the ideas of a self-rotating flame, which gleamed in a manner resembling a flaming sword of steel. And this mention of the *sword*-like gleaming gives great force to the executive significance of the entire assemblage of phenomena which were entabernacled at the tree of life.

We now proceed to observe that, the law of change is a law of all organised existences; from embryonic origin onwards unto maturity, decay, and death: and this law of change had place in the constitution of primeval man. But in his case, as innocent, provision was divinely made for contravening this law of change; and that provision was the tree of life. And, availing himself of the re-invigorating virtues of the fruit of that tree, he was capable of living for ever: and this capability was insured to him so long as he remained non-disobedient to the prohibitory law under which he was placed, as a subject of the moral government of God, his Creator.

But by his disobedience, the first, *the generic*, man forfeited his personal life or existence, and became subject to the law of sin and death—*a proper and utter death*; to which, when arraigned, he was explicitly doomed by his Divine and righteous Judge: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return into the ground, for out of it wast thou taken: for dust (*atoms*) thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

In the executive intent involved in the creation of the first pairs of terrestrial living creatures we have discovered the basis of the cherubic phenomena: but the reason for their particular forms remains to be further discovered and shown.

We are expressly told that those appearances, together with the self-

Digitized by Google

rotating and sword-like fire in the centre, were instituted to debar disobedient man from access to the tree of life.

But on what principles of necessity were they instituted?

First, because that, after the sentence of death was pronounced, it was physically possible for man to evade the execution of that sentence, except he were thus debarred. *Secondly*, because that man's innate love of life and desire to live for ever, and his now excited abhorrence of even the idea of the death denounced—*the utter extinction of his being*—would certainly have prompted him to seek to evade the execution of his sentence, by having recourse to the sovereign virtues of the tree of life. And, *thirdly*, because that the holiness, justice, veracity, and benevolence of his Creator and Judge could not permit that the pronounced sentence of doom should be evaded.

Our next inquiry relates to the fundamental occasion for the special character and forms of the entabernacled phenomena. Can we discover the special occasion for that self-rotating and gleaming fire, and for those likenesses to the heads of the four grand divisions or orders of the living creatures upon the earth?

In prosecuting our inquiry, we must, in the first place, consider the *then* state of the human intelligence; respecting which it is evident that the mental faculties of the first human pair, at that time, were of a very juvenile order. This is evidenced by their attempt to hide themselves from the view of their Creator "amongst the trees of the garden." It is apparent that, in the exercise of those mental faculties, they had not advanced beyond a perception and appreciation of sensible characteristics or qualities. Most certainly, they were not able to form "abstract ideas" of the personal and governmental attributes of God.

They had been caused to know their Creator through sensible manifestations of his presence, suited to the limit of their mental capacity. And it is highly probable that the LORD God appeared to them in a vehicle of light or flame, by which—in their innocence—they were not repelled, but, rather, were attracted; the sound of its approach, filling their hearts with pure and reverent delight.

They could not form abstract ideas of the holiness of God—the oppositeness of his moral excellencies to moral evil or sin: but subsequently, when they had sinned, they could recognise in the entabernacled and self-rotating flame a symbol of the Divine Presence; and its sword-like gleaming would serve to impress their disordered and guilty minds with thoughts of the displeasure of their offended God.

They were not able to form abstract ideas of the omniscience, the repressive power, the majestic might, and the benignity of their Creator and Judge. But they were able to discern and rightly estimate the sensible qualities or characteristics of the living creatures around them; and to which Adam had given appropriate and descriptive names. And hence, they could discern in the cherubic similitudes qualities and characteristics suited to impress their minds with the inutility of an attempt to procure the fruit of the tree of life; and also with thoughts of pure benevolence, as combined with the justice of their Moral Ruler and Judge.

In the eagle, Adam had discerned acuteness of sight; in the bull, repressive power; in the lion, majestic might; and in his innocent and

Digitized by Google

lovely bride, beaming benignity. And for the purpose of illustration, it is lawful to conceive and to present a probable sketch of the scene at the tree of life, as described in the record of Moses. Thus: It would appear that there was only one "way of the tree of life;" and that *there*, the LORD God formed a tabernacle; and in that tabernacle the phenomena described were placed. In the centre, right in front of the tree, the sacred and self-rotating fire glowed and gleamed; and appropriately arranged were the cherubic forms. The far-seeing eagle watched against the approach of the would-be intruder; the massive bull stood ready to trample and gore; the majestic lion crouched, ready to destroy; and the benign, human form and countenance, bore witness of the benevolence involved in the exclusion of disobedient humanity from access to the tree of life.

The deterrent design of the sword-like flame, and the watchful eagle, and the repressive bull, and the crouching lion, is immediately manifest. But the benignity shown in the human form and countenance demands to be particularly considered.

The holiness, justice, and veracity of God required that the sentence of death, pronounced on disobedient man, should not be evaded. But the benevolence of God was, and is, concerned—equally with his holiness, justice, and veracity—in rendering it impossible that sinful humanity should "live for ever." The "wrath of God" is an attribute, aspect, and action of his holy and righteous *government*. It is the active opposedness of his holiness to moral evil or sin. But the benevolence of God is an attribute of his *Nature, of his Heart:* therefore, the unchanged and unchangeable benevolence and mercifulness of God could not permit *generic* man to perpetuate his own existence, and the existence of his posterity, in a state of sin, and of the misery accompanying and consequent upon a state of sin. God cannot permit that man—*as a sinner*—should "live for ever."

(*To be continued.*)

PROBABLE TIME OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

(*Concluded from page* 381.)

THE literal fulfilment of the numbers, 1,260, 1,290, and 1,335, as recorded in Dan. xii., we expect in days, in a little more than the last half of the seven years allotted to Israel's troubles under the "wilful king," according to Dan. ix. 27, and Rev. xiii. 5, in which last passage the period is given as forty-two months. Now as the tribulation the great is to last just three years and a half, or forty-two months, or 1,260 days, and that at the close of that period of time the tribulation ceases, and the Antichrist ceases to reign; it seems evident that the 1,290 is a number alluding to the setting up of the image of the Antichrist just thirty days before the last three-and-a-half years, and that the number 1,335 gives a further difference of forty-five days prior to the setting up of that image, and in all probability indicating the time of the resurrection of Christ's saints, and therefore their complete deliverance from the tribulation the great; for the language of the holy one to Daniel is,

Digitized by Google

"Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. But go thou thy way till the end, and thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." (Dan. xii. 12, 13.)

The 6000th year of the world, i.e., since its re-adjustment for Adam's race, is according to many terminating about the present period. Dr. Seiss writes, "I have been led to believe that we are now, most probably, in the 5,994th year of the world since the creation of Adam; which would bring us, at the present (1863) within some seven years of the sabbatic millennium and the glorious epiphany of our Lord. At any rate we may be pretty confident that we shall reach the consummation before the end of this century." Dr. Seiss therefore thought 1870 would be the terminating year. But N. H. Barbour, of Boston, in his paper, the "Herald of the Morning," has shown, step by step, from Scripture, that it terminated in the Jewish year 1872; this, if ecclesiastical, would end in the spring of 1873; or, if we reckon to the end of the civil year, in the autumn of our year 1873. The texts of Scripture which sustain this date to the captivity are apparently plain—and to them we have but to add the 70 years from the captivity to Cyrus, 536 years from Cyrus to Christ, and the 1872 years from the birth of Christ. And we unhesitatingly believe that the autumn of 1873 witnessed the termination of the 6000th year since the creation of our first sire. We know that a very general and ancient belief obtained, Jewish, heathen, and Christian, that the world would endure six thousand years in its secular and toiling condition, answering to the six periods of creation, to be followed by a millennial period of peace and joy. If these things be so, we have entered upon the last days, and the time of trouble has incipiently, at least, commenced.

The fulfilment of the Lord's prophecy (Matt. xxiv. 14) may be accepted as a sign of the nearness of the end of the age, "and this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." It would be difficult to find a nation now into which the Gospel has not been taken. Up to this last year, 1876, the Bible has been translated into 297 languages and versions.

An important indication of the nearness of the Second Advent may be found in the historico-typical fulfilment of the sixth vial (Rev. xvi. 12): "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates, and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared." By almost all expositors of prophecy, this vial is accepted as meeting its fulfilment in the decay and wasting away of the Turco-Mohammedan Empire; which, during the last fifty years, has lost more than half its territories; as, for instance, Algeria, Egypt, Greece, Moldavia, Servia, Wallachia, &c.—has been almost nationally bankrupt—is now engaged in a war which may compel it to surrender Syria, and probably bring it to a final dissolution. It may yet have another five years to run its course, so that its final dissolution may synchronise with the rise of the lawless king. We have no difficulty in applying this portion of the Book of the Revelation to the decay of the Turkish Empire in a typical sense and in a year-day fulfilment; but we must most decidedly affirm our belief that it can have its strict and more literal fulfilment *only* during the 1,260 literal days of the Antichrist's reign.

It is in the 15th verse, immediately after the events concurrent with

Digitized by Google

the pouring out of the sixth vial, that we read, "Behold I come as a thief Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame"—words which can hardly fail to impress us with the thought, that the Lord's advent for his watching Church will be coincident with the disruption of the Turkish Empire.

Accepting this interpretation of the sixth vial, may we not find in it the preparation of the way for the Jews to return to Palestine? This appears to be the especial object of this vial, as pointed out in these words, "That the way of the kings of the east might be prepared." The actual return of Israel to the land of their fathers will, in all probability, not take place before the removal of the Church; but in the year-day fulfilment of the prophecy we have a preparation made. There is little doubt but that Turkey will be constrained by some means to give up Syria. The following is worthy of note, which appears in a pamphlet just published by Partridge & Co., under the title of "The Coming of the Antichrist," Part 2nd,* that in 1868 a large coloured map was published in Paris, called "Europe under Napoleon III., divided into four points of view, ethnographical, geographical, political, and strategical, designed and coloured according to the indications of a work, entitled Providence and Napoleon III." After pointing out its principal features, the author proceeds to say, "The one feature which pre-eminently distinguishes this map is that Syria is separated from Turkey in Asia, and extended beyond the Tigris so as to include Mesopotamia, with these words imprinted on Syria:—'Return of the Jews into their own country. The Israelites under the protectorate of liberal Europe.' No words," continues the author, "could more clearly and exactly foreshadow the fulfilment of the prophecy of Dan. ix. 27: 'The prince of the coming (Roman) people shall confirm a covenant with many (of the Jews) for one week, or seven years;' in other words, that France, as the leading representative power of liberal Europe, will, in the person of her Emperor—the coming prince of the Latin nations—enter into a covenant with many of the Jews to promote their return to Palestine, by establishing over them a protectorate, to defend them in their newly settled colony; and prophecy tells us that this protectorate will be stipulated to be for exactly one week, or seven years."

This last suggestion we are quite prepared to endorse, fully believing, as we do, that France will be the power, and Napoleon the prince, who will make this league with the Jews. It is doubted. Impossible, "*nous verrons.*"

France has already made rapid progress towards recovery from its predicted "deadly wound" received at Sedan, and is likely yet to take the head of the Roman nations, both in the east and west, and regain a power which will be exercised far more roughly and widely than it would at the beginning of this century.

This same sixth vial speaks of three unclean demon spirits who are to "go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." (Rev. xvi. 13, 14.) These in their historical fulfilment seem to signify spirits of Infidelity, Democracy, and Popery; the first proceedeth out of the mouth of the dragon or devil, the second out of the mouth of the wild beast (in

* Just published by S. W. Partridge & Co., price 3s.

Digitized by Google

type), the Latin Empire, the third out of the mouth of the papal false prophet. Do we not see the first displayed in the Rationalism, Neologianism, Colensoism, and Spiritualism, &c. of the present day; the second, in Radical-Republicanism, Communism, Socialism, Internationalism, and in the struggles between labourers and capitalists; the third, in Jesuitism, Ultramontanism, and Clericalism, manifested in modern pilgrimages and the Roman Catholic revival, and Ritualism? for Popery, though shorn of its temporal power is nevertheless increasing in spiritual pretensions, as manifested in the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of the Pope's Infallibility.

But whilst we hold with that interpretation of the Book of the Revelation which recognises an historico-typical fulfilment, and believe that this sixth vial betokens the expiry of the dominion of the crescent and the revival of revolutionary power, to lead to the fuller development throughout the world of the monster evils of mankind; and that it is just at this period that the Saviour fulfils the prophetic utterance—"Behold I come as a thief;" we also hold most tenaciously the doctrine of a literal fulfilment of this, as of all the other vials of Divine wrath, and think ourselves justified in expecting an ultimate development of events which will literally fulfil the sacred text. Such indeed is the prediction of Isaiah xi. 15: "And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river (Euphrates) and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dryshod." And, again, we have the language of Zech. x. 10, 11: "I will bring them again also out of the land of Egypt, and gather them out of Assyria; and I will bring them into the land of Gilead and Lebanon, and place shall not be found for them. And he shall pass through the sea with affliction, and shall smite the waves in the sea, and all the deeps of the river shall dry up; and the pride of Assyria shall be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away." We know that the Euphrates presents great difficulties to any travelling from the East to Palestine, more especially to kings and their armies. The following extract from "Langhorne's Plutarch's Lives, p. 379, and quoted by Matheetees *in loco*, in his "Apocalypse Expounded," will afford some idea of the difficulties experienced in attempting to cross this great river; "At present he (Lucullus) reached the Euphrates by long marches. He found it swollen and overflowing by reason of the late rains, and was apprehensive he should find much delay and difficulty in collecting boats and making a bridge of them. But in the evening the flood began to subside, and lessened in such a manner in the night, that the next morning the river appeared much within the channel. The people of the country seeing little islands in its bed, which had seldom been visible, and the stream breaking about them, considered Lucullus as something more than mortal. For they saw the great river put on a mild and obliging air to him and afford him a quick and easy passage. He availed himself of the opportunity, and passed it with his army."

The momentous events of the East at the present moment may be typically preparing the way for the return of Israel to the land of their fathers; and be also the time when the Lord summons the firstfruits of his Church to himself (WATCH); but there must be an ultimate chain of

Digitized by Google

events occurring in which will be seen the literal drying up of the waters of the usually deep and rapid great river Euphrates—the actual return of scattered Israel—the outgoing of three demons preparing the nations for the last battle under the direction of the lawless king, and also at that time the calling up out of the great tribulation those of Christ's people who, though they were accounted unworthy to escape with the firstfruits, yet are delivered from the more fearful terrors and penalties of God's fierce anger.

We note the revival of the eastern kingdoms of Greece and Egypt in separate distinctness from Turkey. It only awaits the separation of Syria from Turkey, for the re-appearance of the four kingdoms of Greece, Egypt, Turkey, and Syria.

We observe also the gathering of the nations to war—the vast and formidable armaments everywhere mobilised—and the deadly engines of destruction employed. Such were among the many signs of his arrival which our Lord set down. We have just now nothing more prominently arresting the attention of the nations; wars and rumours of war are everywhere; all the world is arising and preparing for deadly strife; men's hearts are failing them for fear of the evils coming to pass.

The "many are running to and fro," and knowledge being increased is now remarkably taking place, thus fulfilling Dan. xii. 4; not simply the knowledge of God and of his Christ, but simple "knowledge;" knowledge of any kind whatsoever. No one can deny its increase; for the last half-century it has advanced with rapid strides, and has won for itself victories and raised trophies which our fathers would have pronounced incredible and supernatural. What marvellous discoveries in science; what progress in the arts, whether mechanical, the fine, useful, or deadly; what discoveries, improvements, inventions. We presume no one would deem an increase of knowledge in itself to be an evil; but, alas! it is applied more to the development of evil than to the good. It is however a sign of the times. The world is very restless; this for the last quarter of a century has been very marked; a tossing to and fro, men drifting hither and thither, and unable to settle down; a constant change of scene, society, and employment sought; an inability to be still; business now must be exciting, vast, and monopolising; literature also must be fascinating and light, consisting of the fictitious, the wonderful, the thrilling.

One other feature of the present day may be mentioned as indicating the closing days of the present dispensation; and that consequently we should be looking for the Advent of our Lord; we allude to the growing development of lawlessness; everywhere and in everything; and apostasy from the Christian faith. Lawlessness is characteristic of the times; an unwillingness to be ruled. Self-will and determination to submit to none other.

There is an impatience of control, a general selfishness and loosening of all ties, be they domestic, social, or civil. The spirit of the age is democratic, and the cry is, Who is lord over us? This is lamentably seen in the young people of our day; though we had almost said there were no young people in our day. Boys and girls are men and women before their time and are hardly conscious of the season of youth; every thing with them is precocious; and this on account of the latitudinarianism

Digitized by Google

and selfishness of parents, and because education is gone mad. Youthful intellect is developed too speedily, and a worldly, lawless, godless state is engendered.

The "days of Noah" are rapidly developing, when "all flesh had corrupted his way upon earth," and "the earth was filled with violence;" nay, more, "every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart was only evil continually." So also at the overthrow of Sodom, men had corrupted themselves, and the cause is stated to have been "pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness;" or worldly prosperity and self-sufficiency. It is at such a time that the Lord said he should come to his people, and "then shall two be in the field, the one shall be taken, and the other left." (Matt. xxiv. 40.) The lawlessness, carnality, and infidelity of the present day is manifestly fulfilling the language of Paul to Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 1); "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron," &c. (Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 1, 12-19; Jude 4, 8-16.) The apostasy, which has for some time incipiently set in, was the very sign which the Thessalonians received of Paul to denote the nearness of the Saviour's Second Advent; when he said that the event could not take place "except there come a falling away first." All the prevailing scepticism and unbelief is just preparatory to the manifestation of the Antichrist, and consequently to the near and prior coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

All these several signs, with others, proclaim the near advent of our Lord, to raise his sleeping saints and change the living watching ones.

The questions are very important: Did the 6000th year from Adam terminate with the autumn of 1874, and can it be clearly shown so from Scripture alone? We think so. Did other important Scripture dates meet their year-day fulfilment at that same time? Then what may not the spring of 1878 witness? and what, again the autumn of 1881? Agreeing with the pyramidal pillar of witness, we definitely fix nothing; signs may be true and certain, and yet the events which they signify more slow in action than we anticipate; but we do most earnestly entreat the Christian to be on the watch. The signs by which we were to know that our redemption draweth nigh, have for some time been multiplying; they are now intensifying. The state of the nations, the war in the east, the manifest interest which the Jews take in the Eastern question, the historico-typical or year-day fulfilment of Scripture dates, the general insubordination of the masses, the voluptuousness and sensual pleasures of all classes; added to the lack of faith in Christ's coming, and the mocking cry in the churches, "My Lord delayeth his coming," are all signs that the end of the age is here.

One thing only can we do: watch and pray and work in His great name, occupy till he come, "keeping the word of his patience," patiently and attentively observant of the words and signs which he has given, loving the thought of his approach, watching as a bride watcheth for her Lord, so that we may be accounted worthy to escape away from that fearful time of tribulation which is now at hand. Brethren, "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh." E. H. TUCKETT.

Exeter.

Digitized by Google

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE SLEEP OF THE ENTIRE MAN IN DEATH.

DEAR SIR,—With reference to the discussion between two of your correspondents, I trust I shall not be out of place in stating my views.

On the main doctrine, "Life in Christ only," I am at one with both; but feel compelled, by the general and unfigurative language of Scripture, to side with Mr. C. as to the sleep of the entire man in death.

Scripture teaches that man is made from the dust of the earth; that he is animated by an incomprehensible "something" proceeding from God, which is called "the spirit" and "the breath of life," which causes him to live, but is not *the* man, nor really any part of him, but only a gift, which when God withdraws man dies. The word "soul" has evidently various meanings and applications in Scripture, but nevertheless appears to have one proper meaning of animal life, or rather, physical living existence. This is produced by the union of the spirit from God with the created body. See Gen. ii. 7; Eccles. xii. 7; also Psa. civ. 29, 30.

Mr. H. attaches much importance to the passage, 2 Pet. i. 14. Now, in the most literal translation of which I know—viz., that by Robert Young—this is rendered, "Having known that soon is the laying aside of my tabernacle." This does not necessarily convey the idea of the soul putting off the body and living without it. Even in regard to 2 Cor. v. 1-8, I maintain that the "earthly house of the tabernacle" has a wider meaning than simply the human body, and refers to the entire man in his earthly state. To prove that immediately after death we have a "building eternal in the heavens" would upset the doctrine of a resurrection. I cannot in this life be "clothed upon" with a heavenly body, but I may be so clothed with a heavenly nature, and hope to be fully clothed upon in the resurrection, when mortality shall be swallowed up of life. A fair rendering of the eighth verse is, "We have courage, and are well pleased rather to be away from the home of the body, and to be at home with the Lord." What is the home of the body? Mark, not "our bodies." St. Paul frequently speaks figuratively of the church, while on earth only, as the body of Christ, who is the Head and Lord. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) When a Christian dies he is absent from the home of the body, but in the resurrection he comes to his home with the Lord. If there be no conscious interval, death is a gain to the weary Christian. I am not aware that Paul ever speaks of the church triumphant in heaven as "the body;" and in any case a Christian does not look forward to his future new home in "the body," but to being "present with the Lord."

Possibly St. Paul means, "to be absent from our earthly bodies and nature, and without taking any account of the unconscious interval, to be present with the Lord in our resurrection state." Surely Mr. H. will not lose sight of the many passages which, by the separate conscious existence of the soul, would be reduced to absurdity. He argues that a continuous conscious existence is necessary for identity

Digitized by Google

in the resurrection. I send a separate letter on that subject.

I am, yours faithfully,
W. M. Wilson.

Liverpool.

IDENTITY IN RESURRECTION.

Dear Sir,—As the argument advanced by Mr. H.—that a continued conscious existence of the soul between death and resurrection is necessary for proper identity—takes the ground of philosophy I can only meet it on the same ground.

What is it that constitutes identity?

I admit it is consciousness. The material of which man is composed has nothing to do with it. But what kind of consciousness is required? How do I know, from day to day, and from year to year, that I am always the same being? Simply from memory. What man is there who has not at some period during the last year, been in a state of utter unconsciousness? Suppose, at such a period, even of only an hour's duration, God had chosen to annihilate him, and at the end of the hour to re-create him with either the same bodily features as before, or different ones. Suppose that the re-created man remains fully conscious of every point of his previous history, feeling it to be his own history, could we, by any argument, reason him out of his identity? "No," he would say, "my appearance *may* be changed, but I am still the same; I know I am."

Let us say St. Paul is dead, and unconscious; but if God in the resurrection raises a man with a spiritual body, and that man feels himself to be Paul, distinctly remembering his own history; who shall dispute his identity?

Again, what sinner can deny the justice of his sentence, when he remembers that he committed the sins?

In these cases, memory is all that is needed. If the entire man may be unconscious during one hour's sleep without altering personality, why should it be affected if the entire man sleeps for ages? We shall have in resurrection as much proof of our identity, as we have now after every interval of unconsciousness; with the additional evidence of an all-watchful God assuring us that we are the same. And assuredly, the God of Order will allow of no confusion. There will not be two Pauls or two Neroes.

We must remember how entirely our existence depends on the power and will of God, and we dare not put limits to his power to recall to being that which for a time has ceased to be. In whatever state we are, still "In him we . . . have our being." (Acts xvii. 28.)

In connection with this subject, let us examine St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xv. 12-32.

His argument is, If there be no resurrection,

1. Then is Christ not risen, and, consequently, the Gospel is false.

2. Then also they which are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished; that is gone out of existence for ever.

3. He adds, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." This intimates that the future life is resurrection life.

4. In the twenty-ninth verse, he advances an argument, based on the rite of baptism for the dead, which no man clearly understands.

5. He argues that the sufferings of Christians are worthless and foolish. "If the dead rise

Digitized by Google

not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Now, one objection raised against the unconsciousness of man in death is, that although future life depends on resurrection, nevertheless, the soul is kept in conscious existence with a view to a resurrection of the body.

The other objection is, that the whole argument depends on the resurrection of Christ, so that we should read St. Paul's words, thus: "If the dead rise not, then is Christ not risen, and your faith is vain; so let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Surely, any man believing in a future life at all, would have rather said, "Let us embrace Judaism in that case." Although this objection is so absurd, it has been seriously raised. Still, if to disprove the resurrection is to destroy the Gospel, we must not forget that the resurrection life is the only future life taught in the Old Testament. The first objection is more deserving of serious answer. That it is not absolutely necessary for the soul to be kept conscious in order to preserve the identity, I think we have already seen. The idea that the soul is kept conscious with a view to resurrection is not found in Scripture, and the objection is only an attempt to avoid an otherwise obvious conclusion. If it be possible for the soul to be kept in a separate conscious state for a limited time, what is to prevent it from being so kept for ever? If St. Paul entertained such an idea at all, surely he was very hasty and illogical in saying, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Now, Scripture calls death a sleep, and resurrection an awaking. See Job xiv. 12; Psalm xvii. 15; Isaiah xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2; John xi. 11.

But how does this agree with the idea of the soul being kept awake all the time the body is dead! A man cannot be awaked if he is not asleep. Still this objection says the soul is kept awake, to make a resurrection (or awaking) possible. In this life, when a man sleeps soundly, the soul does not remain awake, and surely we shall not be far wrong if we apply the analogy to the sleep of death.

In conclusion, I must say that these words of St. Paul appear to me conclusive proof that he had no conception of any conscious intermediate state; and if we could approach the subject without the bias of our theological education, we should all think with him.

I am, yours faithfully,

M. M. Wilson.

Liverpool.

LITERATURE.

Prophecy, and the Eastern Question. By Robert Roberts. London: F. Pitman.

This is a well written and popularly argumentative work, *apropos* of the present conjuncture of religious and political affairs. The argument is cogent; the exposition lucid, and the style accurate. The author professes to exhibit the light shed by Scripture on the Eastern Question. In doing this, he affirms the approaching fall of the Ottoman Empire: indicates the certainty of a war between England and Russia; the settlement of the Jews in Syria, under a British protectorate; the final attempt to

Digitized by Google

overthrow, and plunder them by Russia, and allied European powers; and as a sequence, the second coming of Christ, and the setting up of the kingdom of God in the the world.

Mr. Roberts justifies the issue of his work by the general expectation of the Church, and to a remarkable extent of the world, that the eve of great events has come, replete with the utmost consequences to mankind; and the conviction entertained by close Christian students of the Bible, and of the "signs of the times," that we have arrived at the period styled in Scripture, "the latter days;" and on the eve of the predicted terrors and glories by which they are to be characterised.

A remarkable exemplification of what the world thinks, lately fell under our notice, in a leading article of a scientific journal, upon the pages of which, we believe, a religious speculation or opinion never appeared. The editor observes "The cause of the universal depression in business, arises not only from past and present, but also from the anticipation of coming events, and it is in regard to the future, that we feel so greatly concerned. Will the war be confined to the powers now engaged, and if not, what would be the consequences of a more extended conflict? If Russia conquers Turkey, *that would be no settlement of the Eastern Question;* Russian oppression is no better than Turkish misrule. The increasing armaments speak for themselves, and show the apprehension that universally exists." These words were printed by persons who have no sympathy with the views of Mr. Roberts, and yet they are almost identical with the language he uses,

Mr. Roberts lays down certain principles of exposition, which have been sustained by the greatest masters of biblical exegesis. He shows that all prophecy is in the main connected with the destiny of the Jews, and correlatively with the Christian Church. In this light the prophecies of the Old Testament which bear upon "the latter days," are expounded. The book of Revelation he sees to be in part a repetition of those prophecies under other forms and symbols.

The ruin of the Mohammedan Empire, and the gathering of the nations to the great battle of Armageddon, he thinks inevitable. The *modus operandi* he partly draws from the vision of the Apocalypse, but more specifically from the Old Testament disclosures relative to this and the coming times. The Jews, meantime, are restored to their own land, and their prosperity tempts the allied races of Europe, with Russia at their head, upon an expedition of plunder and conquest. Britain in vain, defends her *protégé*, the holy land, from such powerful enemies, when Christ appears upon Mount Olivet, scatters the nations, reveals himself to the hitherto unbelieving Jews, as he that was to redeem Israel, and sets up the kingdom "of which there shall be no end." The personal coming of Christ to conquer, reign, and rule, is incontrovertibly proven by Mr. Roberts; and his closing paragraphs glow with solemn and impressive eloquence on that glorious subject.

The First Adam and the Last Adam. By William Morris. London: W. H. Guest, 29, Paternoster Row.

A SINGULARLY valuable book as a repertory of seed-thoughts on the greatest subjects. The theologian, the scientific physician, and the in-

Digitized by Google

dependent thinker meet in the person of Dr. Morris, and the result is an instructive and suggestive volume which intelligent men will prize. The book appears, too, at the proper time, for men are everywhere asking questions which mean, "Let us have more light on theology." The avowed object of the RAINBOW is to give that light as far as its writers can, and we are happy to say that Dr. Morris has kindly consented to be one of our contributors. We ardently wish that the circulation of the Magazine were doubled or trebled that the thoughts of the able men who write for us might reach a far greater number of minds. If we could, we should be glad to post two or three hundred copies monthly to influential names; in addition, of course, to those who are regular subscribers. Through the generosity of a friend something has been done in this way, and attention has been thus called to the great question of the day in quarters where in all probability it would have remained unknown. There may be others who would wish to imitate this good example "for the truth's sake." If so, we should be deeply thankful to hear from them.

NOTICES.

"F. W. S." According to our reading of the Scriptures, you are perfectly right in opposing the doctrines you name. To look for the manifestation of the Antichrist, the national restoration of the Jews, or the uprising of "divinely inspired heralds of the advent," instead of quietly waiting and hoping for our LORD HIMSELF, is all wrong—so many snares of the enemy whose work it is to deceive. Our simple position, according to Scripture, is to wait for God's Son from heaven (1 Thess. i. 10); to look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ (Phil. iii. 20); and to cherish that blessed hope the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (Tit. ii. 13). Any doctrine that comes between us and that is to be unhesitatingly rejected as of men, and not of God. The Eastern Question is already producing initial results—those of excitement among the Jews, and a partial return to Palestine, proofs that prophecy has not spoken in vain; but the Antichrist who comes in his own name, and whom the deluded nations will receive (John v. 43), and the horrors of the great tribulation, are not to be placed between the waiting Church and the return of her Lord to take her unto himself (John xiv. 1-3).

"J. H.," a beloved sister in the Lord, sends us the following notes:

"PALESTINE, THE JEWISH PEOPLE, AND THE EASTERN QUESTION.

"There is a fact which impresses itself the more deeply on the mind the more fully we consider the Divine interpositions in the past: viz., that of the employment of natural means, in the ordinary succession of events, to bring about supernatural results. It is the final event which, viewed by itself, seems at a distance unlikely, impossible, miraculous, supernatural. Yet, very often, God brings it about, not only slowly and unobservedly by men, but through the concurrence of natural causes, and under the influence of circumstances long at work. To the believer

Digitized by Google

there is here the most striking evidence of the reign of God. Alike in nature, in history, in providence, and in grace, there is nothing sudden, or—so to speak—without its line of causation.

" 'The Kingdom of God'—visible, supernatural, and unexpected—'cometh not with observation.' It does come; but, unobservedly.* Not the manner of its coming, but its presence and character are the great miracle; as is, also, this other fact that it has come unobservedly. It was not otherwise in the restoration of our fathers from Babylon; which in so many respects, will bear close analogy to the present return (of Jews to Palestine). And it ever is so, that God's greatest miracle lies in this—that He brings about heavenly results by earthly means, all unheeded and unthought of; thus 'moving in a mysterious way,' while performing 'His wonders,' carrying out 'His bright designs,' working 'His Sovereign will.' "—[From *Israel's Watchman*, edited by Dr. Edersheim.]

" JEWISH TRADITION AND HISTORICAL FACT.

"The tradition is a very old one among the Jews. It is to the effect that Constantinople is the gate to Jerusalem. The historical fact is, that modern Rome is not the representative of the Imperial Rome to which St. Paul and the other New Testament writers refer. That representative is not Rome, but Constantinople—also built upon 'seven hills'—to which Constantine the Great formally transferred the seat of the Roman Empire and Government; and which, at its dedication, was actually named '*The Second*, or *New Rome*.' "

" A recent traveller writes to our leading journal as follows: 'Everywhere, from Dan to Beersheba, I saw evidence of the renewed energy and activity of the Jewish race. As a people, the Jews are flocking back to the land of their forefathers, in great numbers, from all countries in Europe. In Jerusalem and its neighbourhood particularly, every plot of ground for sale is eagerly bought up by them.'† [The Land and the People of Israel in the near Future.]—*Israel's Watchman.*"

"EAST AND WEST."—In connection with these subjects we may mention that Mr. G. B. Chaloner has published—Partridge & Co., price threepence—his paraphrastic copy of the prophecies of Daniel. The full title of this deeply interesting and suggestive paper, is "East and West: Their final Troubles and Conflicts (now beginning) before the end of Jacob's Trouble, Jer. xxx. 7. A Paraphrastic Copy of the Prophecies of Daniel, undertaken to make clear their general intent and bearing towards each other and the events they foretell." A distinguished Hebrew critic has stated his belief that the author is "on the right scent as to the exposition of Daniel."

---

* That is, while it is only in process of fulfilment. When once prophecy translates itself into accomplished reality, the great actual fact becomes patent everywhere and to all. "As the lightning that lighteneth, &c., so shall the coming of the Son of Man be." "Neither shall they say, 'Lo, here!' or, 'Lo, there!' for the Kingdom of God is among you!"—immediately, unmistakably, apparent to every eye.—T. H.

† See Jer. xxxi. 38-40, and xxxii. 36-44. Prophecies remaining unfulfilled—excepting very partially and temporarily—until, and as it would seem, in reserve for, the *present* time. The first stage in their final and perfect accomplishment has already been begun.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

OCTOBER, 1877.

SPEAKING FOR THE FUTURE.

IT has been done in all past ages since prophecy began, and it must be done still. Inspired prophecy speaks for the future, and wise men "take heed" to it both for light and comfort. It gives them at once education and peace, for it informs them of God's gracious purposes towards the human race; and, therefore, whatever trouble may come upon the world, they look forward with calm hope, knowing that God will keep his word and do all that he has said. He will be faithful whatever commotions may disturb the nations, or even lash them into fury, and therefore those who believe him have "strong consolation." Secular history, though it had no intention of becoming a commentator for God, has amply proved that the Hebrew and Christian seers were under the control of ONE from whom the future concealed nothing. The man who asks if the Bible is true, thereby convicts himself of inexcusable ignorance of "profane history." The world's historians have unconsciously attested the veracity of heaven's prophets. The man, therefore, who will not allow God to have anything to do with the affairs of nations is a sceptic both in relation to the Bible and human history—an outlaw from the region of evidence, with whom facts are worthless, and upon whom the clearest and most logical argument is simply thrown away.

But it may be said that surely there are none in this "enlightened nineteenth century, in educated England," who reject the accumulated evidence, both sacred and secular, that the destiny of the world has been anticipated and outlined by men whose writings are found in the Bible. Those who are not well acquainted with the philosophical literature of the day, as well as those whose knowledge of what is called "scientific theology" is also limited, may think so, but it is nevertheless the fact. Modern science, in the hands of some of her chief professors, is in deadly antagonism to the oracles of God. Scripture history, cosmogony, prophecy, and

Digitized by Google

doctrine are all either directly denied, or contemptuously ignored by the "the higher criticism" as unworthy of serious argument. Much of the fashionable scepticism of the so-called "cultured circles" is simply the parrot-like echo of these profound "thinkers."

Thinkers! Undoubtedly they are. We should be the last to underrate either the intellectual endowments or acquired knowledge of some of these men. But is there not something amazingly perverse and illogical in using thought for the purpose of undermining the first postulate of all thought—a living, all wise, and omnipotent God? It is violently against all evidence to make the Mosaic cosmogony a myth, and to place the Hebrew prophets in the category of impostors who wrote history after the event, and pretended that they had foreseen ages before what they describe. But even this, wild as it is, is but a trifle compared with the notion of a world without a Maker, a creation without a Creator. Absurdity can go no farther. We say nothing now of piety and her intuitions, for these belong to another line of study; but reason is confounded by the utter unreasonableness of this *non sequitur*. You may call Moses a fabulist and Isaiah a pretender if you like—although we shall continue to adore God for the one as the inspired historian of creation, and for the other as the inspired prophet of redemption—but to tell us that this vast world of earth and water, with its beautiful "light-bearers" of sun, moon, and stars, came into existence without an Almighty and All-wise Maker is too much —*really too much!*

To think God out of his own universe is an exploit for which there is no sufficient analogy. He complains by Malachi that the Jews had "robbed" him in tithes and offerings; and the husbandmen in the parable, instead of acknowledging the owner of the vineyard by rendering the fruits in their seasons, beat the messengers and planned the death of the heir that they might seize on the inheritance; but here is a case of inconceivably daring robbery, in which the Creator is "robbed" of his entire creation!

What then, under these circumstances, and at this advanced period of the world's history, is the duty which devolves upon us who believe God and his prophets? (2 Chron. xx. 20.) It clearly consists of two things neither of which can we neglect with impunity.

1. We must entirely repudiate those theological errors which have done so much to create a prejudice against the Bible. Theology teaches, and has for ages taught, *as on biblical authority*, things for which the Book gives not the shadow of warrant; nay—to put the proposition positively instead of negatively,—things which the Book both expressly and implicitly denies. Something —nay, *much*, thanks be to God!—has been done of late years to prove that the incredible notion of human immortality, and the terrific doctrine of the eternal torture of the vast majority of these

Digitized by Google

so-called "immortals" are figments of a dark and cruel age that understood neither the nature of man nor the character of God. We must continue to show by the living voice, by the press, by constant reference to the Holy Scriptures on the meaning of life and immortality, and by a liberal use of money in circulating Scriptural literature, that the merciless theology of the schools, and the merciful revelation of our Heavenly Father, are irreconcilably opposed to each other on these subjects. We reverence antiquity, and revere learning, and even make much allowance for men who think they are doing God service when, in ignorance, they say things about him which are not true; but we must not allow antiquity to dictate the incredible when we can appeal to a still more venerable antiquity for that which is at once credible and beautiful; and we must not permit human learning to overawe us when we have the divine learning of prophets and apostles to lead us into all truth.

Many things have crept into the creeds of so-called "Christendom," of which Christianity knows nothing; and it is our duty, both to God and man, to point out and remove the foreign matter which has so long and so disastrously been presented to the nations as the very truth of Heaven. In doing this earnestly, prayerfully, and perseveringly we shall serve our generation in the VERY HIGHEST SENSE; and we may be quite sure that every intelligent Christian who is led to see that immortality is only to be had as the gift of God in Christ, and that a day comes when there shall neither be sin nor sorrow in the universe, will hail these doctrines with delight and thankfulness, and hold them fast to the end. Every new recipient will be a fresh advocate of that which so gloriously illustrates the character of God, so clearly magnifies the work of Christ, and is so worthy of universal acceptation on the part of men.

II. We must speak for the future by showing that the prophets have foreseen and foretold all the leading characteristics of these days, including that scientific scepticism which has put Moses and the prophets out of court, and is trying hard also to get rid of God. We shall have no difficulty in this. It requires no strain upon the mind, and scarcely any trouble of search. The photographs of such philosophers were taken long ago and sent out over the nations, that they might be identified—*and shunned*—when found. Moreover, these despised and ignored prophets have not scrupled to tell us what is to be the result of the world's atheistic science and philosophy, that is to say, what are to be its effects, for a time—fearful woes to the nations under Antichrist, the Atheist—and its end once and for ever—ignominious destruction, never to re-appear in the universe of God.

We must speak for the future by repeating prophetic assurances that an age of peace is coming to our war-smitten world. The day comes when the Prince of Peace—God's anointed—shall set aside the provisional royalties, "the kings of the *earth*," and inaugurate

Digitized by Google

his universal empire over the whole broad world and "under the whole heaven." He deserves this high trust, and will prove himself worthy of it. It is his by inheritance, as the Son of David—heir to the throne of Israel; as the Son of Abraham—"heir of the world;" as the Second Adam—Lord of the coming "Paradise;" as the Son of God—"appointed Heir of all things." It is his by inheritance and his by acquisition. The kingdom of peace, prosperity, and righteousness must come when the will of the Father shall be done upon the earth as it is done in heaven. This foredetermined issue cannot be prevented. Infatuated men will "associate themselves" to defeat the divine purpose, but their armies will be broken in pieces, scattered like the chaff of the summer thrashing floor, and be devoured by the beasts of prey and the ravenous birds of the air. The Lord's purpose will stand, and he will do all his pleasure, (Joel iii. 9, 21; Ezek. xxxix.; Dan. vii.; Rev. xix. 17, 18).

We must speak for the future, under the direction of the Lord's prophets, respecting a perfected and glorified Church. That "Christendom" is apostate from the holy faith once delivered to the saints is not to be denied. Itself gives the glaring proof. But the chosen ones, the Body of Christ, the temple of the Holy Spirit, will yet be seen in matchless beauty and royal dignity in the presence of the Lord in his glory. He will lose none, he will forget none of his redeemed. They will all be presented to his Father "without spot or wrinkle or any such thing," and so shall they ever be with the Lord, his appointed judges, princes, and kings, in resurrection incorruptibility, over his great and glorious empire. "Wherefore comfort one another with these words," respecting the absolutely certain future of the "heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ."

EDITOR.

NOTES ON 2 TIMOTHY III., IV.

No. II.

THERE is yet another passage which requires to be mentioned in this connection. "Little children," says St. John, "it is the last period (ἐσχάτη ὥρα) . . . already are there many Christ-opposers; whence ye know that it is the last period" (1 John ii. 18);" because (his argument is) these latter, who could not have appeared until the first general manifestation of Christ, are the inevitable precursors of, and lead up to, *the* Christ-opposer (ὁ ἀντίχριστος) who, as you know, shall be destroyed by Christ at his coming to the earth in glory, an event which will necessarily terminate these periods of time during which man has been permitted to rule upon earth. Thus we have "the last period" of St. John, or time of

Digitized by Google

the Christian dispensation: "the after times" of St. Paul, or period from the end of the apostolic age to the Second Advent: and "the last time" of St. Peter and St. Jude when the mockers shall appear, a period which appears to be almost equivalent to "the last days" of St. James and St. Paul, but perhaps to be of somewhat longer extent. All unprejudiced Biblical students are struck by "the marvellous precision of the Word of God," and filled with astonishment at the harmony of its statements from Genesis to the Apocalypse, statements which, when rightly understood, are seen to fit into each other like the pieces of a dissected map: and in these days of doubt and danger I would strongly urge upon those who accept the Bible as a revelation of the will, doings, and purposes of God, the desirability of its study in the original languages, or, failing this, the careful use of reliable assistant works." (Such, e.g., as *The Englishman's Hebrew Bible*, Bagster and Sons, 1877; *The Holy Bible, with various Renderings and Readings from the best authorities*, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1876.)

In the last days, shortly prior to the Second Advent, "grievous (χαλεποί) times shall present themselves." This word is the equivalent of the Latin *difficilis*, and implies a period when, to use a familiar expression, it will be hard to get on; the Greek writers apply it to hardships generally, and to anything of a *trying* character, e.g., "The severity (τὸ χαλεπὸν) of the wind." There will indeed be storm and tempest in the last days, for, let it be remembered, the times when the apostle wrote were grievous, the class of men whom he condemns then existed, and the vices and errors named in his black list prevailed on every side. Yet there is no point in his words unless we understand them, as we undoubtedly may, to imply that at the end of the present age the evils of his day will show themselves vastly intensified; or as he himself just after puts it shortly and strongly, "Wicked men and impostors (γοητες) shall make progress towards the worse, deceiving and being deceived." They, like others, are not stationary; they advance, they descend. And we may to some extent see how this must inevitably be so; the wicked at the end of the age will have a very greatly increased amount of unsanctified experience and of godless knowledge, together with an ever deepening hatred of the truth. In considering this subject I utterly disclaim all intention to dogmatise about times and seasons, to prophesy without the gift of foretelling, a lamentable practice which, together with that of applying prophetic passages of Scripture to any rather remarkable event of the time, has brought sad discredit upon the study of the unfulfilled portions of God's Word; I would simply endeavour to present some facts which, inasmuch as they tend to keep Christians watchful and careful, must needs have a good influence.

In his first letter to Timothy the apostle gives the singular injunction, "Unhallowed and old-womanish myths (μύθους) reject"

Digitized by Google

(1 Tim. iv. 7); and so far as Timothy was personally concerned in the matter, these were doubtless the "Jewish myths" which St. Paul similarly orders Titus to reject (Titus i. 14; cf. 1 Tim. i. 4), the enormous net of idle legend and invention which even then enveloped almost the entire Old Testament, its histories and commands. But in the apostle's second letter we meet with these myths again, and in a form which deeply concerns us in the present time. He says: "There shall be a time when they [the people of the period referred to] will not bear with healthy [ὑγιαινούσης. With the Greeks hygiea was a concept representing health in the widest sense, the "mens sana in corpore sano" personified] teaching; but in accordance with their own inclinations they shall accumulate teachers, having an itching in the ear" for novelties, like the Athenians. (Acts xvii. 21.) "And from the truth they shall turn away the ear, *and shall be turned unto myths.*" (2 Tim. iv. 3, 4.) And now in connection with this very remarkable prediction let me call attention to the recent work of the learned Hungarian savant Dr. Ignaz Goldziher, *Mythology among the Hebrews*, a translation of which by Mr. Russell Martineau, of the British Musuem, appeared in February last. This work, which has naturally been much criticised (Vide *Athenæum* and *Academy*, March 10th, 1877), bids fair to make an epoch in the treatment of the subject. It is no superficial, vulgar attack on Christianity such as past times have so frequently produced, but is as temperate in expression as it is profoundly learned in character. Dr. Goldziher is an admirable Semitic scholar, familiar also with the modern scientific literature of Germany, Holland, France, Italy, and England; he has very carefully and closely studied the Old Testament, and at what result has he arrived? Simply at this, that until the time of Samuel or thereabouts we have in reality no *earthly* history recorded in its pages. What have we then? Nothing, save the childlike views of archaic man on the ordinary phenomena of nature. Adam and Edom the "Red," signify the sun; Abram, the "High Father," is the nocturnal heaven; his wife is Sarah, the "Princess of Heaven," i.e., the Moon; their son is Isaac, the "Laugher," the rejoicing sun which follows the night, and who in his turn is sire to Jacob, the "Follower," i.e., the Dark Sky of Night which follows the bright day. Joseph is the Rain; Rachel, his mother, the Cloud; Noah is the Sun at Noon; Naphtali the Dawn; Samson the Sun whose eye is put out at night; Shem, the Heaven; Zebulon, the Setting Sun; Barak, the Lightning; Deborah or the "Bee," the Rain Cloud; Dan, the "Moving," i.e., the sun. Any one entirely unacquainted with the progress of the science of comparative mythology, and who has not studied such writers as Prof. Max Müller, Dr. Tylor, the Rev. G. W. Cox, Profs. Kuhn and Steinthal, and Signor Angelo de Gubernatis (*Zoological Mythology*) may be inclined to treat such views as mere "midsummer madness;" but a brief investigation of the subject will

Digitized by Google

suffice to convince a far seeing mind that a profound chain of argument against the plain truths and declarations of Holy Scripture is being manufactured by an artizan of no ordinary ability. It may easily be supposed that with opinions such as these Dr. Goldziher practically denies the inspiration of Scripture and the very existence of the supernatural. Thus that Elijah ascended to heaven in a chariot of fire is merely a childish or poetical way of saying that the sun rises, and other miracles receive corresponding explanations. Dr. Goldziher is also of opinion that the religious belief of man has been produced by an exceedingly slow evolution, that there is no innate and instinctive monotheistic idea in the human race, but that all monotheism is developed out of polytheism. According to this view all present religion is founded on the lowest germs of religious instinct or feeling, on the grossest fetishism and nature-worship. His chief English critics who have yet spoken deal with him very tenderly; his ideas are exceedingly able, they say; many of his views are undoubtedly correct but he goes somewhat too far. How such theories, if true, may affect the New Testament and Christian belief in general is too paltry a question for such superior beings to notice.

Now, while firmly believing that Dr. Goldziher's theory is utterly baseless, and would be condemned as surely by true scientific tests as it is by the undoubted declarations and entire teaching of the Bible, it is certainly not my intention in the pages of this Magazine to enter into any arguments on the subject; that I shall assume to be quite unnecessary so far as the readers of the RAINBOW are concerned, although the defenders of the once delivered faith will undoubtedly have to grapple with the question and with the whole vast assumption of religious evolution elsewhere. What I desire here is simply to call the attention of the students of unfulfilled prophecy to the solemn declaration of the apostle and to a prominent literary event of the time. In a work published only five days before Dr. Goldziher's, I wrote, "One of the vastest questions that can be submitted to the mind—a question, moreover, which is rapidly coming to the front in the great debates of the age—is, Whether religion and all that it entails sprang from man's unaided cogitations upon himself and the material world around." (*The Great Dionysiak Myth*, vol. i., preface. Longmans, 1877.) I was aware that the question would soon be formally raised, but hardly expected it so very speedily. It is connected with the baseless theory of evolution, so thoroughly destroyed by Dr. Elam in his admirable work, *Winds of Doctrine*,—a theory for which not a particle of real evidence has ever been produced, a most arbitrary and unwarranted hypothesis. Dr. Goldziher's work even now does not stand alone, and is only a precursor of a cloud of similar productions. Far and near the trumpet note of attack upon the Christian faith resounds. The author of *Supernatural Religion* has just completed in a final volume his laborious assault. Viscount

Digitized by Google

Amberley in a brief life laboured hard on the same side, as his large work, the *Analysis of Religious Belief* demonstrates. Dr. Colenso is stated to have been engaged for some years past on a work on Messianic prophecy, and others, whose name is legion, for they are many, armies of doubters, as Bunyan would call them, environ the now desponding Town of Mansoul. And what can Christ's "sheep" and "little children" oppose to these? In themselves, nothing. We are right to say what we can for the truth; to argue, after the example of Paul and Stephen; but, be it ever remembered, that "marvellous things," can be said, and shall still more be said against the God of gods. Our faith is not based on man's wisdom but on God's power. A time is coming when faith will be exposed to such a trial as she has never had from the foundation of the world; but forewarned, forearmed. And here, in order to avoid a possible misunderstanding, let me add a word in favour of the study of the ancient history of the world, especially as revealed by the recent discoveries in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile. This field is not only most interesting in itself, but eminently useful in the illustration, and, so far as the human mind is concerned, in the confirmation of the Old Testament history and teaching. Archaic research, far from confirming the theory of religious evolution, shows to demonstration that, in accordance with the statements of the Bible, the earlier phases of religion in Western Asia were the simplest and the best; that there has been no uninterrupted advance in matters religious but an undoubtedly retrograde movement and degeneracy, in which connection let the reader carefully consider the statements of St. Paul in Romans i.; and lastly, that a merciful God did not leave the ancient world without witness of his grace and glory, but alike in the course of nature and in the heart of man showed himself and drew near to his creature. (Vide Acts xiv. 15-17; xvii. 22-29.) It is the love of the truth which alone can preserve us from being turned away after myths and fables, which alone can save us from bondage to baseless and "unhallowed" ideas that, though they may seem plausible and even profound, shall like the strange fire offered by Nadab and Abihu, at last consume their votaries. Let us by faith lean only on the truth personified. He who makes us free, will keep us so; and our little knowledge can rest with no uncertainty upon God only wise.

R. BROWN, Jun., F.A.S.

(To be continued.)

Digitized by Google

DIVINE LOVE.

FATHER, hast thou no blessing to bestow?
Am I too late in coming with my plea?
The righteousness of Christ is bountiful:
Is there not one small bounty left for me?

Speak *thou*, my Saviour; calm my restless soul:
Say, doth the Father turn his face from me?
Thy message, Lord, was pardon free and full;
I know my need—thou know'st my poverty.

Is the Almighty man that he should lie?
Who seeketh findeth pardon full and free;
Weary and heavy-laden sinner come—
Thus saith the Scripture—cast thy care on Me.

Lord, in the blood-bought robe of thy dear Son,
With childlike confidence I now draw near:
His faithfulness was weightier than my sin,
His love, so perfect, hath cast out my fear.

His love, so true, unloosed my load of sin:
His love sent down the Comforter to me:
Mine was the love that nailed him to the cross;
'Tis his—not mine—that welleth up to Thee.

H. BURNETT.

"THE REGENERATION."

"Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."—MATTHEW xix. 28.

THE "regeneration" here spoken of was apparently a familiar subject to our Lord's hearers, and embracing as it does the restoration and government of the twelve tribes, it seems highly probable that it is either identical with, or will be included in, what the Apostle Peter afterwards calls, "The times of restoration of all things."

We know that our Lord and his disciples, as well as the Jews in general, were deeply interested in the promised kingdom of Messiah; of which so much had been written in the prophetic Scriptures. It was by far the most prominent subject in the public discourses of our Lord, and in his private instructions to his disciples. It was the topic of conversation at some of the most solemn moments of his life, and many of his most valued promises are associated with it. At the last supper he said: "I will not drink

Digitized by Google

henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." And after his resurrection, when he was seen of them forty days, he spake "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." This subject of "the kingdom" was always uppermost in the minds of the disciples, so much so that on one occasion our Lord spoke a parable "because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." We are in no uncertainty, moreover, as to the manner in which they always understood the promises concerning this kingdom, and their own position in it. Their expectations are clearly indicated in the request of the mother of James and John: "Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left, in thy kingdom" (or "in thy glory," see Mark x. 37). Seeing how their minds were occupied with expectations of a glorious kingdom and an exalted position therein, we may safely conclude that when our Lord spoke of the *regeneration*, when he himself would sit on the throne of his glory, and they also would *occupy thrones*, they would at once understand him to be speaking of his *kingdom*, and that the regeneration would be one of its characteristics or accompaniments; a conclusion that is greatly strengthened by what he afterwards said to them on this subject: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke xxii. 29, 30.)

It is often said that at this time the Apostles altogether misunderstood the nature of the kingdom of heaven; that they were carnal, and looked for an earthly kingdom. It does not appear, however, that our Lord ever corrected what are supposed to be their erroneous views; neither is there any evidence that their expectations were afterwards changed or even modified. They were in error respecting the time of its manifestation, but as to the nature of the kingdom itself, they were evidently well instructed; for our Lord himself said to them, "to you it is given *to know* the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;" and when he had in parables unfolded to them some of the characteristics of it, in reply to his question, "Have ye understood all these things?" they said unto him, "Yea, Lord." After his passion he was "seen of them forty days," and spake "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God;" but their question, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" shows that their expectations were unchanged. Nor does the Lord's answer in the least indicate that they were wrong in the views they held. He told them plainly that it was not for them to know the times or the seasons, but he did not warn them that they were cherishing false hopes and expectations which he surely would have done had they been really doing so.

The writings of the apostles show that to the last, the kingdom

Digitized by Google

of God was the object of their most ardent hopes, to which they constantly directed the minds of others. The following are examples of the teaching of the Apostle Paul: "Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the *kingdom of God*" (Acts xiv. 22). "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the *kingdom of God*, shall see my face no more" (Acts xx. 25). "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the *kingdom of God*, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts xxviii. 30, 31). "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the *kingdom of God?*" (1 Cor. vi. 9). "And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his *heavenly kingdom*" (2 Tim. iv. 18). At the close of the Apostle Peter's life, when his end was near, he wrote: "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the *everlasting kingdom* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. i. 11); and the Apostle James asks: "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the *kingdom* which he hath promised to them that love him?" (James ii. 5.)

There is no truth in the whole Bible more clearly and emphatically stated, than that the Lord Jesus Christ, who was taken up into heaven, shall come again in like manner as he was seen to go into heaven. His coming again is repeatedly referred to as the blessed hope of his followers, for then they also shall appear with him in glory. But it is quite as clearly revealed that the great object of his coming is to establish his kingdom on the earth and reign over it with his chosen ones; and very much is said concerning the nature of this kingdom, its extent, its rulers, its subjects, its duration and its issues. In our Lord's day this subject was doubtless much better understood than it is in the present day. The great error of the Jews appears to have been in thinking that the kingdom was theirs on mere national grounds, because they were the children of Abraham. But our Lord taught them, "*Except a man be born again* he cannot see the kingdom of God," and that "Many shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

In the Sermon on the Mount, there is much said to correct the prevailing error respecting those who are to inherit the kingdom; but there is nothing to show that the nature, dignity, and glory of the kingdom itself was not rightly apprehended. "The poor in spirit." "They which are persecuted for righteousness' sake." "Those who do the commandments of Christ and teach them." "He that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." These

Digitized by Google

are the persons who are to inherit the kingdom; to the exclusion of the scribes and Pharisees who sought glory of men.

In our own day the "kingdom of heaven" is understood to mean something so vague and indefinite that it takes innumerable forms and definitions, according to the teaching of different persons; but nearly all agree in rejecting the Jewish idea, without inquiring whether it is scriptural or not; and whether it was condemned or countenanced by our Lord and his apostles.

The more this subject is looked at in the light of both the Old and New Testament, the deeper will become the conviction of its importance. Perhaps it is not going too far to say, that *Messiah's kingdom* is THE subject of the prophetic Scriptures; and that "*the regeneration*," and "*the times of restitution of all things*," are included in it. All the prophets speak of a glorious time when the GREAT KING shall reign in righteousness and have dominion over all the earth; when men shall be blessed in him, and all nations shall call him blessed. One dwells upon the beneficent character of the government of the king, and its happy results; another states that the saints of the Most High shall possess the kingdom, when the ancient world-kingdoms represented by the head, breast, belly, and feet of the great image of Nebuchadnezzar's vision, are all broken in pieces and consumed by it; whilst another writes: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

That it is the same great and glorious kingdom that is spoken of by all the prophets, though in a variety of ways can scarcely be doubted; the whole being comprehended in the good tidings first announced by John the Baptist: "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS AT HAND." Our Lord himself went everywhere preaching the good tidings of the kingdom, and at the close of his ministry he said to his disciples: "AND THIS GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM SHALL BE PREACHED IN ALL THE WORLD FOR A WITNESS UNTO ALL NATIONS; and then shall the end come." The Apostles never lost faith in the good news of the kingdom so emphatically announced by our Lord; they diligently strove to be themselves, and desired that others too might be counted worthy of the kingdom of God for which they also suffered; and they exhorted to diligence and holiness, so that an abundant entrance into it might be obtained. The Apostle Paul went about preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching that it is through

Digitized by Google

much tribulation we must enter into it; and warning us that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance therein.

The importance of a subject so largely dwelt upon in both the Old and New Testament can hardly be exaggerated; and it seems strange that that which is *so manifestly a future thing, to be inherited by the righteous only,* should ever have been misunderstood and confounded with the present dispensation, in which the righteous are led to expect sharp discipline, severe trials, and sore chastisements, in order that in their Father's house they may be vessels unto honour, sanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work. Their present lot of trial and suffering is repeatedly placed in sharp contrast with their future: "For I reckon," says Paul, "that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." "For our light affliction; which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." "If we suffer, we shall also REIGN WITH HIM." Trial and suffering in some form or other is still the lot of all that will live godly in Christ Jesus; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. But although often severely tried and chastened, the children of God ought to know that their Father in heaven is seeking their profit, that they may be partakers of his holiness; and they are exhorted and encouraged by their Lord himself: "But rather seek ye *the kingdom of God,* and all these shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

* A. H.

DEATH THE ENTIRE EXTINCTION OF LIFE.

"COMPARING spiritual things with spiritual," according to Paul's rule, has enabled us, at least in some measure, to understand his meaning in 2 Cor. v. 1-10 without supposing him to cherish a hope which he never held out to others; viz., the hope of being "present with the Lord" before the Lord's return. But into what inextricable perplexities and confusion would Mr. Hayward's theory lead us should we read the passage and context in an attempt to decide who, or what, the frequently used personal pronouns, *we, us,* and *our,* may possibly mean? We begin at chap. iv. 14. "He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." Here all seems plain. The joint hope of Paul and the saints in Corinth was to be raised up of God by Jesus, and "presented together." Presented, no doubt, together "before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy," at the resurrection. But in verse 16 we read, "though our

Digitized by Google

outward man perish, yet the inward *man* is renewed day by day." And here the dissecting process begins. In March RAINBOW, p. 137, Mr. Hayward says, "We think it will not be disputed that by his outward man he means his body. He had already just previously spoken of it as an *earthen vessel* (iv. 7), and had represented himself as bearing about *in the body* the dying of the Lord Jesus (iv. 10), implying that only so much of his proper self as was comprised in that body was undergoing the process of dying. And by his *inward man* we think he cannot but mean the soul," &c.

It is with sadness that we contemplate the extent to which the glorious beauty and harmony of Divine teaching may be marred and obscured by speculations about "body-men," "soul-men," and "spirit-men." Just read verses 5, 6, and 7 in connection with verse 16,—"We preach not *ourselves*, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us;" and then say what need there is for making mysteries in any of these verses. Surely this dividing of a man into parts and elements can only be required by the exigencies of a theory. Hear Paul:—"I think that God hath set forth us" (not our bodies) "last, as it were appointed to death." (1 Cor. iv. 9.) But though "bearing in their bodies the dying of the Lord Jesus," yet they were not discouraged, never "cast down;" for the "light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," which had "shined in their hearts," kept them always rejoicing. Glorying even in their tribulation; because tribulation worketh patience," while they "rejoiced in hope of the glory of God." The knowledge of it gave light and joy and hope within, the hope of an abiding glory; not like "the glory of Moses' countenance which was done away," with which it is contrasted (chap. iii. 7); nor to be looked on with "veiled face," as the Israelites looked on the glory of Moses' countenance, as contrasted, verse 18, but with open (unveiled) face, "beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory." No wonder indeed of their "inward renewing." Their afflictions were "working for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory:" while, by faith, looking at it, though "not yet seen;" in patient hope of it, while not yet come, not yet realised. Was it indeed the body, as contrasted with either soul or spirit, the apostle spoke of as an "earthen vessel?" Forbear, forbear! Ask us not to wholly destroy the beauty of the glorious passage by reading: "We have this treasure in our bodies that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of our bodies?" The contrast certainly is not between soul and body; but the "earthen vessels" are the apostles

Digitized by Google

themselves,—not a mere part of them,—and the contrast is between the despised and reviled messengers, and the "treasure" which God had committed to their charge. Had the apostles preached themselves, their preaching might have been slighted; "but we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." And the "treasure" with which they were entrusted,—"the ministration of life,"—"the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,"—the very "Gospel of the grace of God," which had "shined in their hearts," was in every respect as worthy of "all acceptation," though communicated through these "men of the earth, earthy," as though a messenger of highest celestial rank had been the medium of communication. The light shining in the apostle's heart by the "knowledge of the glory," dwarfed even those toilsome years of his unceasing labours into a "moment not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." And should his warfare cease before the "revelation of the glory," and he himself be "absent"—"out of the world," before the "coming of the Lord," for whose return he longed; yet he was confident that he would hear the voice of HIM who is the "resurrection and the life," and come forth to be "presented together" with those who are not "absent," but who are "alive" and remain unto "the coming of the Lord."

We are further asked to "ponder our Lord's words" (John xii. 24), "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit;" as another proof text for "preserved life in death." We have pondered these words of our Lord with heartfelt gladness, and the comments on them with deep sadness and dissatisfaction. Now, Mr. Hayward, with his fruitful fancy, fertile resources, and rich vocabulary, might have made the heart of his readers glow with sacred warmth over this beautiful figure, had it not been for that "soul-man theory" always obtruding its gaunt form, and demanding that almost every figure must be compelled to do it homage.

Figures, however, must be cautiously dealt with, seeing my "odd account of a figure" has been a little roughly, and not very fairly dealt with in May number, pp. 227-8. That a figure, and the thing figured, may be compared to a ball on a plane, in one particular aspect, may not perhaps be a very adequate, a very appropriate representation, although, even yet, I see nothing amiss in it; but that is a matter of very small consequence, provided it has not led to any misapprehension, or misapplication of a Scripture figure. That it has done so has not been shown. My statement was that an agreement in *one* point, between a figure and the thing figured, justified the use of a figure, even although disagreeing in all other respects. Is there anything so very "odd" in this? Are there not many Scripture figures of this kind? How many different

Digitized by Google

things are figured by the "seed?" in the sowing, its growth, its fruit, and the harvest? I never said that a ball was a figure of a plane, nor anything that could be justly construed into any such meaning. But a ball rests on a plane although there is only one point of contact; and a figure may represent a fact although there is only one point of resemblance; neither need that point of resemblance be of "arbitrary selection." And better surely to be content with one point of likeness than outrage a figure in order to find more. And where does Mr. Hayward find even *one* point of resemblance between his theory of "soul-life through death," and the figure employed by our Lord? A "corn of wheat falls into the ground and bringeth forth much fruit;" but its much fruit is the "full corn in the ear," *many* grains instead of *one*, not "ampler and more glorious life" in the one grain that falls into the ground and dies! It is dead. Its life has departed. This surely is "confirmed by our own observation of the course of nature," and no profusion of ambiguous terms can conceal the fact. Is it not, then, a mistake, and *not* true that "its life is preserved *through* death?" unless it be held that its life is preserved by being absorbed, first in the blade, then in the ear, then in the full corn in the ear, but never restored to the *grain that dies*. And this certainly cannot figure "preserved personal identity through death!" In the case of the grain, the parent seed dies, but it "bringeth forth fruit, in some thirty, in some sixty, in some an hundred fold." In the case of man in death, some imagine that they find a surviving "spirit-man," others, a surviving "soul-man." Mr. Hayward claims "the continued junction of soul and spirit," to make up his surviving man; while Scripture recognises only, as man, that which each rejects. And as Mr. Hayward rejects with scorn the averment, that his theory makes two men out of one, he must yield up this figure which he has unlawfully appropriated to its support. The figure, no doubt, as used by our Lord, has its proper application to HIM, and to him alone "who gave his life a ransom for many;" who died, not that he might have "ampler life" in death; but "died for us that we might live together with him." Hence it is prefaced with these words, "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified;" and I am astonished that any one should ever think of applying it otherwise. My account of a figure, moreover,—which is reckoned so "odd,"—that an agreement in one point with the fact figured, justifies the use of the figure, seems finely illustrated in this case. Between the "much fruit"—the many grains—brought forth by the death of the *one*, and the *many* believers receiving *life* through the one Christ that *died*, the likeness is perfect. But in what else in the figure is there any resemblance? The one grain falls into the ground, gives life to others, itself dies, and lives no more; but the ONE, Christ, that died, himself says, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore!" So that, in one and the self-same figure, we have likeness and contrast

Digitized by Google

equally perfect: and the figure, moreover, not a selected one for the occasion, but one for which I have to thank Mr. Hayward.

"He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting" (Gal. vi. 8), is another passage where Paul uses the seed and its fruit, for a different purpose; and is also quoted (p. 185) to prove that believers have everlasting life NOW, and consequently can never die. Again I ask where is the likeness between the figure and the predicate? From another apostle's testimony that the "husbandman *waited* for the precious fruit, and had long patience for it till it received the early and the latter rain," I conclude, that then, as now, there was an interval between seed time and harvest; and that a man could not sow and reap the fruit of what he was sowing at the same time; so that the apostle's figure, instead of being a likeness, is as complete a contrast to Mr. Hayward's theory as can well be conceived. And that this is the true, and not an "arbitrarily selected" point of the figure, the next verse clearly demonstrates. "Be not weary in well-doing (i.e., be not weary of sowing), for in due season we shall reap if we faint not." Reap what? Why, "life everlasting." Mr. Hayward would have us to reap out of season, and merge seed time and harvest into one period. But with the apostle, "sowing to the spirit,"—the "life of well-doing,"—precedes "reaping life everlasting," even as sowing time precedes reaping time in the course of nature.

It would have been desirable that Mr. Hayward had told us wherein, according to his theory, the contrast of our Lord's words lies, when he says, "Your fathers did eat manna and died; he that eateth this bread shall live for ever." For the question be it remembered, is not about "living for ever;" but whether a man is preserved in life between death and resurrection. And as Mr. Hayward admits that unbelievers "are preserved in life through death," we say again that any argument based on spiritual life having BEGUN NOW, only complicates instead of simplifying the question. For if life preserved through death, be true of believer and unbeliever alike, then the life preserved is not dependent on the "bread eaten." What, then, is the difference between the death of those who were fed in the wilderness and the death of other men? Is it not to be the portion of any one of those who did eat of the manna to live for ever? Are none of them preserved in life till resurrection as it is contended others are? If not, why are they made exceptions? It was not those that *sinned* in the wilderness, but those that did eat the manna—which was no sin—of whom it is said "they died." Nay, that they "*are dead.*" Yet they were highly favoured of God. Indeed, those so fed might, with peculiar propriety, have used the words of Psa. lxvi. 9, "Which holdeth our soul in life;" for God's preserving care over Israel seems to be the theme. Thus, in vers. 5 and 6, "Come and see the works of God. He turned the sea into dry land; they went through

Digitized by Google

the flood on foot." And with the manna "he kept their soul (i.e., themselves) in life." Read the whole context in John vi. with our Lord's teaching elsewhere and all is plain. The Jews themselves it was that, with pride, spoke of their fathers having been fed "with bread from heaven." Our Lord replies, "Your fathers did eat manna and are dead." "If a man eat this bread which I shall give, he shall live for ever;" it "endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you." Now I do not ask for any "interval of extinction" in the "life everlasting;" but I am entitled to ask, what is the difference, *in death*, between those who "believed on Jesus," and those who did "eat of the manna," even those of them of whom God testified, "They have followed me fully?" Are the former "preserved in life" by the "continued junction of soul and spirit," and the latter *dead*, body, soul, and spirit, through the death period, or what? Eating the manna did not cause death! It *preserved life!* But all theories aside, let us look at the contrast in its plain natural meaning. God preserved Israel in life in the wilderness by feeding them with manna, when want of food would otherwise have resulted in death. But the manna only preserved them for a time, in "this life," in "this world;"—but our Lord neither promises to preserve his disciples in *life* in this world, nor in *death!* On the contrary, he elsewhere tells them emphatically that by "eating of this bread," that is, as admitted, by their believing on him, may be the very cause of their "*losing their life* in this world:" while in contradistinction to all that is promised them in "this present time," he promises that they "shall receive in the world to come life everlasting." (Luke xviii. 30.) Do believers receive "everlasting life" twice—first in "this world," and again in "the world to come?" We confess that we know of no promises of "vastly more life" to follow after receiving "everlasting life." And it is, moreover, a most significant fact that in John vi. our Lord, while promising "everlasting life," and stating it as being "the Father's will, that of all which the Father had given him, he should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day," he no fewer than four times says, "And I will raise him up at the last day." Thus unequivocally demonstrating that without resurrection, they would *be lost*, and consequently could not attain to "everlasting life." But why should this be the case if "believers," as is averred, alike independent of body and of resurrection, live on in "conscious happiness" through the whole period of death. Why is resurrection necessary?

The interpretation put upon our Lord's words in John ii. 19; x. 17, 18, I cannot on any account accept. That our Lord voluntarily "gave his life a ransom for many," is a precious truth in which I rejoice. That he could have escaped death I do not doubt. "Know ye not," said Jesus, "that I could pray my Father, and he would immediately send more than twelve legions of angels who would deliver me out of their hands." And although he could say,

Digitized by Google

"My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death," yet he would not pray for deliverance; for, said he, "for this cause came I unto this hour." But when we are asked to believe that "Jesus truly died, and that he, the same Jesus, when dead, resuscitated his erst mortal frame, requickened his own body," in fulfilment of his own words,—"No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself—I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again,"—we begin to wonder what *death* means, and whether there be not as much of life in death, as there is even in life itself. Could our Lord possibly intend such a use to be made of his words? If these words teach that God the Father, into whose hands he commended his spirit, did not "raise him from the dead;" then they teach also, with, at least, equal force, that no man was guilty of his death. And are not both postulates directly contrary to the uniform teaching of Scripture that *men killed him*, but that GOD raised him from the dead? "Jesus of Nazareth, ye have taken," says Peter, "and by wicked hands crucified and slain; whom God hath raised from the dead, having loosed the pains of death," &c. "Ye killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead." "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." (Acts ii. 25; iii. 15; v. 30.) Thus, although Jesus "laid down his life,"—placed his life in man's power,—yet men killed him. And though "he rose from the dead, God raised him." So also "the dead in Christ shall rise;" but, said our Lord, "I will raise them up." And again, says Paul, "He that raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus." In all this diversity of language we can recognise perfect uniformity of teaching; and witnessed to by the Lord himself in these words: "As I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." But is there no equivocation,—no mere play upon words, when it is said that "Jesus truly died; but that he, the same Jesus, when dead, requickened his own body?" If our Lord "lived in soul through his death in body;" and thus whilst *living in soul* requickened his *dead body;* is it candid to say that "the same Jesus when *dead* did so? Would it not rather be the *living* Jesus quickening the *dead* body? And in what respect can this be a just interpretation of our Lord's words, "laying down his life and taking it again?" Is it not rather "laying down the dead body and quickening it again?" I regret exceedingly to feel it necessary thus to write on such a subject. His "soul was made an offering for sin." He "poured out his soul unto death." "Come, see the place where the Lord lay," said the angel of the Lord, who rolled back the stone. "I am he that liveth and *was dead*," said the risen ONE." Let us accept the statements in humble faith, and with becoming awe to whatever conclusions they may lead.

When our Lord said, "Lazarus sleepeth," and his disciples did not understand him, he then said "plainly, Lazarus is dead." We prefer to follow our Lord's rule by explaining figure with matter of

Digitized by Google

fact statements, rather than attempt to explain matter of fact by figure. Quite enough has been said regarding sleep. Even if there be those who have experienced much conscious happinesa in profound sleep, it affords but small ground for hope that they will experience the same in death. We can cherish no such hope, neither can we ascribe "renewing and renovating" power to death: and those who, "in resurrection, come forth magnificently renewed," will, we doubt not, ascribe the honour and glory, not to death, but to the Lord of life who redeems them from death.

When some Scripture can be found presenting a "disembodied man" to our consideration, it may claim attention; but so long as we can find no such being among all the creatures that God made at the beginning, nor any account of him in after times, we are content to confess that we know nothing of such a being. And, to use Mr. Hayward's words, "it is not I who make the Scripture say," that what God made of the dust is the man. In Scripture he is so designated equally before receiving life and after life is taken away. Equally before he became a "living soul," and after he ceases to be a living soul; but we have asked in vain for a passage where either a soul or spirit, or even "both in conjunction," apart from a body, is called a man. True, it is replied, "The Scripture does often speak of the soul of man, as the man, without any mention of the body;" and Rom. xiii. 1, and ii. 9, referred to "as instances out of many." But unless it be that the word "soul" occurs in each, we do not see why any other passage might not have been referred to as well. "God will render tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil," is the one, and "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers," is the other. In the former it is "every soul of man," and in the latter, the soul is *not* called a man, but the man, in his entire personality, is called a soul: and had it even been prefaced with another passage from the same epistle (chap. viii.), "But ye are *not in the flesh*, but in the spirit," it would have been difficult to convince any one that Paul was enjoining souls, apart from bodies, to "be subject unto the higher powers." And why such an evasion as to substitute "a soul without *any mention* of a body," instead of "a soul *apart from* a body?" Passages in which the entire man is designated a soul are numerous, and needed not to be pointed out. He who has but read the first book of the Bible is well aware of this. The first Adam, on receiving "the breath of life" became "a living soul." We are told also that "two souls were born to Joseph in Egypt," "without any mention of bodies," but not without bodies we presume. And,—"without any mention of bodies,"—that "three score and ten souls of the house of Jacob came down to Egypt;" but the waggons of Pharaoh sent for their conveyance thither can scarcely be conceived to have been necessary had they been souls without bodies. Instances need not be multiplied, but the passage where a soul apart from a body is called a man has not yet been given.

J. MILL.

Cupar.

Digitized by Google

GRACE AND GLORY.

"The Gospel of the Glory."—2 Cor. iv. 4.

O LORD, my heart, adoring, glows;
For thine exceeding grace,
A pure perennial river flows,
For men of every race.

Nor clime nor country bars thy love,
Nor sin of darkest hue;
It comes through Jesus from above.
It blesses Greek and Jew.

Its tender tones have won the heart
That nothing else could win,
And made it choose the better part
That turns away from sin.

But higher still thy grand design,
Than scenes of fragrant grace;
Celestial splendour yet will shine
From thy most holy place.

The Saviour comes, the Life, the Light,
To crown thy wondrous plan;
Then earth with glory shall be bright,
For he will dwell with man.

ABRAHAM'S NIGHT VISION AT BEERSHEBA.

ABRAHAM was an hundred and twenty years old when he received the strange and startling command to offer his only and beloved son Isaac for a burnt-offering, upon an unknown mountain in the land of Moriah. The message came to him in a vision of the night, in his quiet home in Beersheba. We can well imagine that there would be no more sleep for him that night, after he had heard that mysterious and awful voice which spoke only to him, and which himself only could hear.

He already passed for an aged man, even upon the longer average of human life in his time. His heart had lost much of the fervid and hopeful feeling of youth. It was no longer easy for him to bend before the storm of affliction, and rise with renewed strength when the blow was past. It would be a bitter thing for him now to be made to drink more deeply of the cup of sorrow than he ever had done in the days of his young manhood.

It is easy to face the storm while the heart is fresh and full of hope, and we can rise up from every disappointment strong in the purpose and promise to reap the fruits of success and repose in after years. But it is very hard for an old man to find that the sorest trial is reserved for the last, when the burden of age is heavy upon his shoulders and the fire of youth is dim in his eye. Fifty years before, when Abraham left the

Digitized by Google

land of his fathers, the love of adventure, the impulse of curiosity, the prospect of a long life yet to be enjoyed, would help him in his first great act of obedience to the Divine command.

The announcement of the voice in the night vision at Beersheba must have fallen upon Abraham like a peal of thunder from a cloudless sky. And the terms in which the terrible command is expressed seem as if they were intentionally chosen to harrow up his soul. Every word is a dagger to pierce the father's heart. Four times over, the emphasis falls just where it would give him the deepest pain: Take now, thy son, thine only son, Isaac, whom thou lovest, and offer him for a burnt-offering. It would have been enough to break an old man's heart to lose such a son by the ordinary course of sickness and death. Then he could be watched and comforted, and his last hours soothed by the acts of parental tenderness and affection. But how could a father shed the life-blood of that son with his own hand? How could he heap on the fuel and the fire that must burn his body to ashes in his own sight?

If Abraham had been a selfish, cold-hearted man, caring little for the ordinary attachments of kindred and home, never concerning himself to know who should bear his name when he was gone, it would have been a sad day for him when he found himself childless and alone in the world. How much darker must that day be to the kind, generous, and affectionate old father! How cruel, how inhuman must have seemed to him the voice which commanded him, with his own hand, to extinguish the life in which he himself lived anew in his old age! How contradictory for him to put out the light which had been kindled to enlighten all nations, to lead all wanderers into the right way.

If it had been his silver and gold, his flocks and herds, his servants and herdsmen, his promised land and peaceful home that he was to give up—if he had only been commanded to spend the remainder of his life in poverty, and wandering, and exile,—it would have been a hard lot for an old man. But it would have been nothing compared with the command to sacrifice his only son with his own hand. Nay, more, it would not have seemed so strange, so terrible, so contradictory—it would not have cost the father's heart such a pang—if it had been himself that was demanded for the sacrifice.

We know not what passed in the patriarch's mind when he received the message. But we almost seem to hear him say in an agony of surprise and sorrow: "Oh, my son, my son! would God I could die for thee! I am old and withered, and in a few years, at most, I must be gathered to my fathers. Let the remainder of my days be accepted as a free-will offering, that the sole joy of my heart and the hope of my family may not utterly perish in the death of my son."

Then, again, the seeming contradiction between this new command, and all the instructions and promises which had already been given to Abraham, must have added perplexity to his mind and agony to his heart. The voice came in a vision of the night. Strange, terrible, and unaccountable it must have seemed to him at first, as if he had dreamed, or as if some tempting and tormenting demon had assumed to speak in the name of the Lord of hosts. Restless and alarmed, he rises up early, that the cool air of the morning may arrest the feverish dream, if it were only a dream, that had disturbed the peaceful sleep of the night. As he

Digitized by Google

passes silently from the inner to the outer apartment of the tent, and looks upon the calm face of his sleeping son, he feels for a moment as if the blood of the dreadful sacrifice were already upon his hands. He shudders as the awful scene, upon some unknown mountain, flashes upon his mind. The repose of that peaceful countenance, dimly seen when the curtain door is lifted, makes the father groan in spirit when he thinks of the terrible secret in his own heart.

He steps forth silently into the open air and looks up. The coming dawn has just begun to tip the edge of the eastern hills with light. Above him the clear blue dome of Arabian skies is all ablaze with the fiery hosts of stars. He remembers that his fathers worshipped those peaceful orbs "beyond the flood," and that no such message ever came to them from the silent depths of the firmament. He remembers that the Divine voice which called him out of Chaldea fifty years before, had once said to him, "Look now toward heaven and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them; so shall thy seed be." And can it be that now that same voice has commanded him to slay his only son?

The morning breeze from the mountains of Judah raises a cloud of dust as it sweeps across the broad sandy paths where his vast herds are wont to come down to the wells of water. And again he remembers the words of the Divine voice, "I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered." And now has that same voice commanded him to slay his only son? And shall he believe both, when one contradicts the other, and so, at last, an old man go childless and in sorrow to the grave?

He looks away northward and eastward, and he sees the baleful light of altar-fires blazing upon the hilltops. And he well knows that on those high places the heathen inhabitants of the land offer their own children in sacrifice to Moloch and Baal and Chemosh. And shall the worshipper of the true God become like one of them and stain his hand with the blood of his own son?

The wind moans through the sacred grove of terebinth, as if in sympathy with his great sorrow. He walks between the wide-spreading branches of the oaks, where he had many times met angels face to face. He listens and strains his eye in every direction through the gloom of the waning night, if peradventure he may descry some celestial messenger coming to relieve his perplexity. He bows at the foot of the altar which he has reared unto Jehovah, in agony of prayer for more light. But his mind grows darker as the night wanes. Every sound seems to echo the dreadful word: "Take thy son, thine only son, Isaac, whom thou lovest."

The dawn comes slowly up the eastern heavens, and now he can hear the lowing of his flocks gathered by thousands in distant folds, and eager to be led forth while the air is cool and the grass is fresh with dew. The full day and the fiery noon will soon come on. If the journey be undertaken at all, there is no time for delay. If the command be from God, and it must be obeyed, the quickest obedience will be found the easiest and the best. Abraham knows all this, and the father of the faithful is not a man to dally and shuffle with excuses, and tamper with his own conscience when once the way of duty, however hard, is plain.

Digitized by Google

So Abraham goes silently to one of the tents where his servants sleep. Of the hundreds at his command, he selects two. They prepare the wood for the sacrifice and lay it upon the beast of burden, and the aged father, with a tender and tremulous voice, calls his son. When Isaac wakes and starts to his feet, the old man turns away his face. He cannot meet the innocent and unsuspecting look of the victim named in the voice of the night. Shall the father tell the son where he is going and what is the object of the journey? Oh, how can he conceal it?—how can he tell it? Not now—not here. There will be a better time to break the awful secret to the son when they are far away upon the long and lonely journey. But shall not the son be permitted to take leave of his mother? It would be cruel not to do so. And yet how can it be done? It would cause alarm and confess the whole object of the journey, and perhaps make it impossible for Abraham to obey the Divine command. He himself could not witness the parting.

And yet, shall not the fond old mother be told that she is to see the face of her beloved and only son no more? Must that son, that only son, die a bloody death, and by the father's own hand, and she not be consulted—she not know it till all is done? Shall she be denied the bitter consolation of giving him one parting word? If the sacrifice must be made, may she not share with the father in the great act of faith and obedience? She must know it in the end. Will it be right, will it be honourable, will it be kind to tell her only when it is all over? Must the grief of never having one word of farewell, must the bitter feeling that her only son was *stolen* from her and slain, be added to her worse than orphan's woe?

All these questions and many more must have passed through the mind of Abraham as he started from Beersheba in the dim light of the early morning, with Isaac and the two young men. It must have been a sore task for his wonted serenity and self-possession, to go forth from his home, shutting up in his own generous and magnanimous heart the dark and dreadful secret of the voice which he had heard in the night, and of the sacrifice which he had been commanded to make.

The very solitude of the first day's journey must have been oppressive to Abraham. In company with his only son, to whom he had ever confided everything that concerned himself and the family, he now travels all day by his side with a secret in his heart, which touches his very life and all the dearest hopes of the family, and he dare not tell him of it. He thought when he started that he could talk with him when alone. But now he can only look at his open and unsuspecting face, and turn away lest the son should see the starting tear and the heaving breast. A hundred times in the day he begins to speak, designing gently to unfold the awful purpose of the journey. A hundred times his struggling emotions become too strong for words, and he stops, leaving his son to wonder at the father's excessive feeling and to inquire vainly for the cause. He feels as if it were deception and mockery to talk with Isaac of anything less than the object of his journey; and yet he walks all day long by his side, and does not tell him of the dreadful deed that must be done when they reach the mountain.

Abraham must have felt relieved when night came on and they all lay down upon the bare earth, and Isaac and the young men slept. Then the

Digitized by Google

agonising father, wearied with the long torture, could withdraw himself from the company, and pour out the sorrows of his breaking heart under cover of the darkness, even as a greater Sufferer prayed in his agony, "Oh, if it be possible let this cup pass from me!" The countless host of stars come out again in all their burning ranks upon the plains of heaven, only to pierce the soul of the patriarch as with a sword, while they remind him so clearly of that Divine promise—"As the number of the stars, so shall thy seed be;" and he is on his way to sacrifice his only son. All night long he waits, if peradventure that voice which gave the terrible command will speak again and tell him that his faith has been sufficiently tried—his son may live. But no such message comes.

The hours of darkness are always long to a sleepless man with the bare earth for his bed. But the morning comes too soon for Abraham; for it brings him the summons to renew his journey and hasten on to the bloody sacrifice. And now he approaches the hills, to every one of which he looks with trembling, lest he shall see the sign of the place where the sacrifice must be made. He passes the oaks of Mamre, where he interceded so fervently for guilty Sodom. But no angels appear to hear his petition for his only son. He ascends the heights afterward named Kirjath-arba, and Hebron, and Bethlehem, and every outlook upon the surrounding country only reminds him that all this fair land, westward to the sea, northward to Lebanon, and south to the desert, was to have been the possession of his posterity. And now, with his own hand and by Divine command, he must cut off his name and inheritance from the earth.

Another day passes as they journey among hills and valleys and streams; and when night comes on, Abraham lies down with the rest upon the bare earth, wearied and ready to perish with having carried the terrible secret of his errand so much longer shut up in his heart. Isaac sleeps, as the lamb sleeps the night before the sacrifice. And the wakeful father only suffers the more keenly when he looks upon the calm repose of his son. Sleeping and waking, he is all the while listening and longing to hear the Divine voice speak once more and say, "It is enough; thy son shall live; and thy paternal heart shall be spared this dreadful pang." But the night passes and the morning of the third day begins to break, and no such message comes. And Abraham must renew the journey with the full expectation that before another evening closes round him the bloody sacrifice will be completed. When another morning breaks, he will be on his way back, childless and broken-hearted, to bear the dreadful tidings of what he had done to his stricken and desolate home.

"Had he not better go back now and never breathe the object of this mysterious journey to any living soul? So his son shall live, and he shall be the staff and joy of his old age. And in time it may be found that this supposed voice in the night vision at Beersheba was all a mistake, a false and feverish dream, growing out of his very anxiety to preserve the life of his only son."

If Abraham had been anything less than the father of the faithful, it would have been easy for him to yield to such fond and parental misgivings, and so he would have lost the fulfilment of the Divine promise through his fears, and the world would have lost the rich inheritance of his great and victorious faith.

Digitized by Google

We all know the conclusion. The journey of the third day is begun. Soon the mysterious sign, doubtless like the flame of the burning bush or the glory of the tabernacle, appears upon a distant height. Now it is settled beyond all question in Abraham's mind that the voice in the night vision at Beersheba was a reality, the command was Divine, the sacrifice must be made. He girds up his soul anew with desperate and agonising firmness to complete the great act of faith.

He lays the wood for the offering upon the one that must be burned. With a trembling hand and a breaking heart he takes the fire and the knife, and goes silently up the steep alone with his son. Isaac wonders where the victim of the sacrifice is to be found, but the father cannot tell him yet. The altar is built by the hands of both; the wood is placed in order for the fire; the last dreadful moment is come, and no delivering angel appears—no Divine voice speaks to stay the sacrifice. The father must tell the son the awful message which he has carried in his own bleeding heart through all the long journey. Isaac himself must be slain, and by the father's hand. It must be with his own consent if he is offered at all. For he is a full-grown man, twenty-five years of age, and he can easily resist or escape the hand of his father, who has a hundred more years upon his shoulders.

We do not know what feelings, what expressions the startling announcement brought forth from Isaac. We are not told what surprise, what horror, what fear, what distrust, what agony he manifested. Had he seen something wild and strange in the look of his father all the way? And does he now conclude that the old man has become insane on the subject of sacrifice? Or does he reason, does he remonstrate, does he resist? Does he claim that the father can have no right to take the life of the son, and that the vision or voice which commands such a dreadful deed cannot be from God?

We do not know what was said, thought, or felt by Isaac when he heard from his father that he must be the victim. But we do know what surpasses all our comprehension—we know that Isaac in the end submitted to the sacrifice. He consented to be bound, as he had seen the lamb bound, and laid upon the altar. He gave up life, hope, everything, just because his father told him, there, on that lonely mount, that it must be so. He looked, as he thought, for the last time upon the face of his father, and then silently waited for the stroke of the knife that was already in the father's hand. Which was most to be pitied it were hard to tell—the father, who must inflict the fatal blow, or the son who submits in silence to be slain. If the sacrifice must be made, the sorrowing father will certainly endure a longer and a deeper agony than the dying son.

Abraham turns away his face, that he may not see when the blood follows the blow. Isaac, with fortitude equal to his father's faith, bids him strike. But now, at length, it is enough. The voice from heaven comes at last. The faith of the father and the submission of the son are sufficiently tried. The delivering angel of the covenant cries aloud, "Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me." And this great act of faith, which made Abraham the father of the faithful, shines forth like the sun amid the darkness of far distant times.—*Night Scenes in the Bible.*

Digitized by Google

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE RATIONALE OF THE DOCTRINE.

PART III.

What is the Resurrection?

WE are now in a position to advance another step in our general argument. Assuming as established, by what was advanced in our last paper, the believer's possession of some such spiritual body as was therein described, immediately upon the dissolution of this "earthly tent-dwelling," the twofold question is at once suggested, *When* and *how* does this spiritual body come into existence? We will endeavour on the present occasion to answer this *When* and *How* separately, and as fully and clearly as we are able. Before doing so, however, we must, in order to anticipate a very obvious objection, remind the reader that the only *Anastasis* regarding either the *period* or *character* of which Scripture gives us any information is that of the saved. The fact that there is to be an *Anastasis* of the lost is indeed twice—and only twice—mentioned in the New Testament; though never in the Old;* namely, when our Lord, in John v. 28, 29, says, "The hour cometh in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life (*ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς*), and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment (*ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως*): and again when Paul, before Felix, gives expression to his "hope toward God" that "there shall be a resurrection (*ἀνάστασις*) both of the just and unjust." (Acts xxxi. 15.) And furthermore, while the *Anastasis* of the unsaved as well as of the saved is thus intimated, though barely as a fact, the *Egiro* of the former class is not even once mentioned; the significance of which very remarkable circumstance will be hereafter pointed out.

---

* Daniel xii. 2 is no exception to this statement, since there is little doubt that the correct rendering of the verse is that given by Tregelles and other eminent Hebrew scholars: "And many from among the sleepers of the dust shall awake; *these* shall be unto everlasting life; but *those* (i.e., the rest of the sleepers—those who do not awake at this time) shall be unto shame and everlasting contempt." Dr. Tregelles adds: "The word which in our Authorised Version is twice rendered 'some,' is never repeated in any other passage in the Hebrew Bible, in the sense of taking up distributively any general class which had been previously mentioned; this is enough, I think, to warrant our applying its first occurrence here to the whole of the many who awake, and the second to the mass of the sleepers, those who do not awake at this time."—*Remarks on the Prophetic Visions of Daniel*, p. 174. And the correctness of this criticism is confirmed, not only by the fact that such is the interpretation given by the most eminent Jewish commentators, but also by the internal evidence of the passage taken in its context. For clearly "the time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation," spoken of in the first verse of the chapter must be identified with the "great tribulation" of Matt. xxiv. 21-30, which will be endured during the reign and blasphemy of the last Antichrist—"the man of sin"—even him "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (2 Thess. ii. 8.) Hence the resurrection here spoken of by Daniel synchronises with the period of the Second Advent, and is plainly a prophecy of the *First Resurrection*, all the partakers of which are pronounced "blessed and holy." (Rev. xx. 6.)

Digitized by Google

Returning, then to the questions suggested, it is asked, *When* does the spiritual body first come into existence? On this point three suppositions are, *prima facie*, possible; first, that the soul will not be invested with it till the last day, being in the interval between its denudation of the natural body and the assumption of the spiritual either unembodied or non-existent; secondly, that immediately after the dissolution of the earthly house, the soul will be clothed upon with the spiritual body then first created; or thirdly, that the spiritual body is possessed, at least in its inchoate or embryonic condition, already even before the external materialism is cast off in death. Now as regards the first of these suppositions—which is also that most generally entertained—it is sufficient to point out that it is not only altogether opposed to what we conceived to be the true meaning of Paul's distinct statement in 2 Cor. v. 1-9, which we fully considered in our last paper, but also implies such a solution of continuity as violates the *fifth* of the conditions which we laid down as essential to any tenable theory of the resurrection. And the same objections apply with almost equal force to the second supposition, since the apostle does not say, "If our earthly tent-dwelling be destroyed, we shall immediately *receive* a building from God," &c., but "we *have*" such a building, even though the earthly tent-dwelling be removed; and moreover, the solution of continuity would be just as complete, and its supposition just as inadmissible, if only one moment be supposed to elapse between the putting off of the one body and the putting on of the other, as though millenniums should intervene. We conclude, therefore, that, in a rudimental form at least, the spiritual body co-exists already with our body of flesh and blood, underlying it even as in the seed the germ of the future plant is contained within the cotyledon, which perishes in death, but in doing so releases the germ to develop into the perfect plant.

The spiritual body, then, *comes into existence before the external materialism is cast off in death*, and when once this conclusion is reached the words of the apostle in 2 Corinthians v. 5, are seen to be both highly significant and important. "But he who wrought us unto this very thing is God, who gave us the spirit *as an earnest*." An earnest of what? Clearly of resurrection—of the possession of the "building from God, the dwelling not made with hands, in the heavens, age-abiding"—of mortality being swallowed up of life." Now the Spirit is given us we know in regeneration, when the hitherto dormant *pneuma* is quickened into divine activity by the inhabitation of the Spirit of the risen Saviour—imparting to it eternal life, and making it *de jure* if not at once *de facto* the ruling and transforming power within us. Henceforth the man who was *psychical* becomes *pneumatical*, as it is written: "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam, a life-giving spirit." (John iii. 5, 6; 1 Cor. xv. 45.) Hence, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation; the old things are passed away, behold, they are all become new." (2 Cor. v. 17.)

We find, then, the true *terminus à quo* of the whole state and process, so to speak, of the *Anastasis* in the second birth. In regeneration we

Digitized by Google

receive the Spirit, and in the Spirit we have the earnest of the resurrection. Nay, more than this; regeneration is itself the resurrection of the spirit; not indeed as some have inaccurately termed it "the first resurrection," but rather, to use once more Paul's expression, "the earnest" and inception thereof. For surely the fact has been strangely overlooked and ignored, that man being a tripartite being, consisting of spirit, soul, and body, he must needs be the subject of a threefold resurrection. The soul and spirit must arise from the death in trespasses and sins, as truly as the body from the death of physical corruption; yea, as we are endeavouring to show, the latter is absolutely dependent on the former as its efficient cause. This is clearly the teaching of the Apostle Paul not only in 2 Cor. v. 2, but in another of his great passages touching the resurrection. In Romans viii. 9-11, we read: "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Now if Christ is in you, the body indeed is (still) dead), (or under sentence of death) by reason of sin, but the spirit is life (is already made alive) by reason of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead *shall quicken even your mortal body through his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*" Here then, if anywhere in the New Testament, the rationale of the resurrection is revealed to us, and is shown not to be—as it is so commonly represented and regarded—an isolated and arbitrary act of divine power, but the outworking of spiritual laws as constant and universal in their operation as the physical laws which govern natural generation and birth. Thus, as Professor Perowne well says, "Christianity establishes our hopes not only by pointing to an outward fact (i.e., the resurrection of Christ), but by the experience of an inward fact, the communication of the life of Christ to all who believe in Him. Jesus Christ is the Resurrection because he is the Life, and he imparts that life to us. 'Because I live ye shall live also.' There is a sense in which it may almost be said, that the resurrection is begun here, because the germ of it is to be found in every renewed and sanctified nature. A power has been put forth upon the man, which must issue in his final and complete glorification. A life has been begun, which in its very nature can never end, because it is the life of God himself. The resurrection to life, though it is sometimes described as a gift, is also to be regarded as the natural and necessary development of the work of grace. Both truths are stated by our Lord in his discourse with the Jews recorded in the fifth chapter of St. John's Gospel: 'Verily, verily I say unto you, He that heareth my words and believeth on him that sent me, *hath everlasting life*, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is passed from death unto life.* Verily, verily I say unto you, The hour is coming and now is, when *the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.* For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in Himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.' Here, as in many other passages of the New Testament, we are taught that eternal life is not merely to be looked for beyond the grave, but is a present reality. There is a quickening of the spirit to newness of life here, as well as a quickening of the body hereafter. Of this twofold life, Christ is the

Digitized by Google

source. Christ gives eternal life to all who believe in Him; Christ raises the dead: and he does both one and the other, by virtue of that divine life which he receives from the Father and yet has in himself (John v. 26; comp. vi. 5), of which he is at once the author and giver. It was to give this life that he came into the world. 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.' (John x. 17.) It is from him that this life is derived; it is only by communion with him that this life can be sustained. So he declares: 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.' (John vii. 51.) And again; 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you.* Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath eternal life;* and I will raise him up at the last day.' (John vii. 51-54). Here likewise there is a reiteration of the same truth; here there is the same intimate connection between the present gift of eternal life, the present partaking of Christ, and the future resurrection to glory. You cannot separate these things. That which is spiritual is in its very nature eternal. Death is but as the episode of a sleep; it has no power to touch the heart of that life which is 'hid with Christ in God.' That life given here in the body imparts to the body a share in its triumph over death, is the seal and the pledge, that even though the body fall into dust, it shall be raised again from the dust, incorruptible. So essential, indeed, is this connection between the life eternal and the resurrection of the body, that it is almost the only view of the resurrection which is presented to us in Scripture. There are, I believe, but two passages in the New Testament, in which the resurrection of the wicked is so much as mentioned; once by our Lord, when he speaks of a resurrection to damnation, to which those that have done evil shall come forth from their graves (John v. 29); and once by St. Paul, when he acknowledges, as a truth common to himself with his Jewish opponents, a resurrection both of the just and the unjust. (Acts xxiv. 15.) But with these exceptions, the other view of the resurrection is exclusively presented; it is invariably spoken of as the fruit and result of a spiritual life, of which Christ is the fountain and source. The one, as it were, by a moral and spiritual necessity, implies the other. 'Even the universal resurrection,' it has been truly said, 'shall be but the natural development of that which now works in the children of God.'"*

Passing now to our second inquiry, viz., *How* does the spiritual body first come into existence, and what are the laws by which its growth and development are governed? we approach a much more dark and difficult subject; one, indeed, upon which neither revelation nor science cast more than a few faint gleams of light. "The growth of the spiritual body within us," it has been truly said, "and the materials out of which it is wrought, are among the deepest mysteries of our being." If there is a very real and profound sense in which it may still be said that we know not "how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child," much less can we hope fully to understand "the way of the Spirit" in the formation of the spiritual body. This much, however, science does seem to teach us, that the substratum of all matter is force or motion, and the

* Hulsean Lectures for 1868, pp. 100, 103.

Digitized by Google

origination of all force or motion, *life*. Now whatever the fundamental character of the life in any case may be, it can manifest itself only in the construction of its own appropriate organism by the spontaneous working of its possessed forces, and by subsequently using the organism thus constructed for the attainment of its own respective ultimate end. In the case of the plant, this end is realised in an embodying organism, in which the life may abide and therein produce successors after its own kind. In the case of the animal this end is realised, in a higher form, in a nervous organisation, in which, through sensation, the life may awake into conscious activity for its own gratification as a living soul. In like manner the spiritual life finds its ultimate end, in the highest mode, in an organisation of subtle and powerful forces adequate to the use and manifestation of its divine energies. As then the soul in the natural man, clothes itself earthwards in a gross and perishable organism, the capacities of which are circumscribed by the five senses and the laws of the physical world: so does the quickened spirit, in the twice-born man, clothe itself heavenwards in an ethereal and imperishable organism, which in its perfect development will be the accurate expression, the faultless and unfailing instrument of its heavenly perfections and powers. But it does this not immediately and of itself, but mediately through the soul in which, as we have before said, the *form* or *ideal* of the body ever abides; nor yet *per saltum*, at some indefinitely remote period, but by an orderly growth, having its definite stages, and proceeding according to spiritual laws: hence the *Anastasis* is to be regarded not as an isolated and arbitrary act of divine power but a continuous process, commencing in regeneration, carried on through and by means of the psychical body, and reaching its consummation only in the *Egiro* at the last day.

Never, so far as our knowledge extends, has so much interesting light been cast upon the probable rationale of the formation of the spiritual body as in that remarkably able work of Professors B. Stewart, and P. G. Tait, to which reference has more than once been made, *The Unseen Universe;* the careful study of which we venture to commend to all interested in this subject. In the sixth chapter, the distinguished authors, referring to the vast dissipation of force or energy which is constantly going on, and "the apparently wasteful character of the arrangements of the visible universe," observe: "We are led to believe that there exists now an invisible order of things intimately connected with the present, and capable of acting energetically upon it—for, in truth, the energy of the present system is to be looked upon as originally derived from the invisible universe, while the forces which give rise to transmutation of energy probably take their origin in the same region. And it appears to us to be more natural to imagine that a universe of this nature, which we have reason to think exists, and is connected by bonds of energy with the visible universe, is also capable of receiving energy from it, and of transforming the energy so received. In fine, it appears to us less likely that by far the larger portion of the high-class energy of the present universe is travelling outwards into space with an immense velocity, than that it is being gradually transferred into an invisible order of things. This last conclusion is, however, more of the nature of a speculation, and is by no means essential to our argument.

Digitized by Google

"If we now turn to thought, we find that, inasmuch as it affects the substance of the present visible universe, it produces a material organ of memory. But the motions which accompany thought must also affect the invisible order of things, while the forces which cause these motions are likewise derived from the same region, and thus it follows, that '*Thought conceived to affect the matter of another universe simultaneously with this may explain a future state.*'

"This idea, however, requires further development and explanation. Let us therefore begin by supposing that we possess a frame, or the rudiments of a frame, connecting us with the invisible universe, which we may call the spiritual body.

"Now each thought we think is accompanied by certain molecular motions and displacements in the brain, and parts of these, let us allow, are in some way stored up in that organ, so as to produce what may be called our material or physical memory. Other parts of these motions are, however, communicated to the spiritual or invisible body, and are there stored up, forming a memory which may be made use of when that body is free to exercise its functions.

"Again, one of the arguments which proves the existence of the invisible universe, demands that it shall be full of energy when the present universe is defunct. We can therefore very well imagine that after death, when the spiritual body is free to exercise its functions, it may be replete with energy, and have eminently the power of action in the present, retaining also, as we have shown above, a hold upon the past, inasmuch as the memory of past events has been stored up in it, and thus preserving the two requisites for a continuous intelligent existence."*

We may further suggest the probability that the spiritual body is elaborated by the action of the quickened *pneuma* through the soul upon the body by means of the nerve-aura, or fluid which envelopes the nerves, and by the aid of which the motion of their molecules communicates sensations and transmits the mandates of the will. This nerve-aura, which has been regarded as the vital force, extends in some measure beyond the body and encompasses us each one with an envelope of nerve-atmosphere varying in depth and intensity in different individuals and at different times. Now this nerve-atmosphere is doubtless the seat of those latent occult faculties of our wondrously constituted nature which manifest themselves, under abnormal conditions, in the phenomena of animal magnetism, somnambulism, trance, clairvoyance, ecstasy, levitation, and much that has fallen, through ignorance, under the denomination of magic; and, assuming the truth of the theory propounded by Messrs. Stewart and Tait, it is in all probability the laboratory in which the transfusion of force from the natural to the spiritual body is effected.

Scripture gives us, indeed, but little help in this matter, and if some earnest Bibliolater should challenge us to "prove it from the Bible," we must frankly acknowledge our inability to do so, but we would, with all humility remind him of the fact that the "speculation" which he so strongly deprecates is oftentimes the only bridge by which we can at all connect one revealed truth with another. At the same time Scripture

* Fourth edition, pp. 199, 200.

Digitized by Google

does not leave us without some few hints on the subject. Thus when Paul in 2 Cor. iv. 16-18,—*which should always be read and studied in connection with the great passage which follows*, 2 Cor. v. 1-9, considered in our last paper,—speaks of an "inward man" which is being developed and receiving new powers (ἀνακαινοῦται), as day by day the "outward man"—the material organism—decays and perishes; we may clearly trace the twofold identity which existed in his own mind, on the one hand between the "outward man" of iv. 16 and the "earthly tent-dwelling" of v. 1; and, on the other hand, between the "inward man" of iv. 16, and the "building from God" of v. 1. Let this also be especially observed, that the apostle represents this twofold process of edification and decay not only as proceeding simultaneously and during the present life, but also as being interdependent the one on the other; the inner man is renewed for the same reason that the outward man decays, what is killing the one is strengthening the other, and *hence* it is that what he calls "our light present affliction"—which nevertheless is so severe that it involves the weakening and ultimate death of the body—is working out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. "For* (γάρ, supplying the reason and ground of the assertion just made) we know that if our earthly tent-dwelling were dissolved we have a building from God, a dwelling not made with hands, in the heavens, age-abiding."

Now in the light of this passage, thus interpreted, let us look again at another statement of the apostle, in Rom. viii. 11: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken even your mortal body through his spirit that dwelleth in you." "Your *mortal body*." The expression is peculiar and even startling. Is it then the *mortal body*—that body which he had just before spoken of as "dead because of sin"—that Paul supposes is to be made alive at the last day? Surely not; such a supposition is barred by his own emphatic statements in 1 Corinthians xv. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." "It is sown in corruption; it riseth in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour; it riseth in glory; it is sown in weakness; it riseth in power; it is sown a natural body; it riseth a spiritual body." "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and *this mortal must put on immortality*." Shall we not rather, then, conclude that this quickening of the mortal body is taking place *here* and *now*; that day by day, by the power of the quickened spirit, a transference is being effected of the finer elements, or to speak more correctly of the ultimate forces, from the psychical body to the spiritual body, even as in the seed the cotyledon is partially consumed in nourishing the germ.

This mention of the seed, again, may recall Paul's use of the same figure in relation to this very subject in 1 Cor. xv., "Thou fool, that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain of wheat, it may be, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body according as he pleased, and to each kind of seed a body of its

* Read the last verse of chap. iv. as a parenthesis, and the thread of the argument runs clear.

Digitized by Google

own." And truly, *understood in this sense*,—not as supposing the existence of a material germ in the natural body,—this "seed" of Paul's becomes something more than a mere illustration; it acquires the force of a close and exquisite analogy. For "modern science has shown that the seed consists of two parts, one of which dies in order to provide nourishment for the other. The little germ that exists in every seed swells with the moisture of the ground in which it is sown, and the perisperm, or cotyledon, which surrounds it, is simply a storehouse of nourishment to enable it to grow, until it has sent its root downward and its plumule upwards, to draw its support from the soil and the atmosphere. The perisperm must die in order to accomplish this; because, until it has been reduced to a soluble, and then a liquid state, it cannot pass into the tissues of the plant." The seed, therefore, must die,—all that we can see when we hold the seed in our hand must die,—in one of its parts though not in the other, and so far the process of germination in seeds is an accurate type of the resurrection. By birth into this world—which is God's "field," (see Matt. xiii. 24, 38,)—men in their human persons are "sown" (Matt. xiii. 37, 38); not, as is commonly supposed, when their mortal bodies are buried in the grave. "The time," says Locke "that man is in this world, affixed to this earth, is his being sown, and not when being dead he is put into the grave, as is evident from St. Paul's own words: for dead things are not sown; seeds are sown being alive, and die not till they are sown."* This is also the view taken by Archbishop Whately: "If we are speaking of the burial of the *dead* body, it is not correct to say that it is sown, or buried, an animal body; for animal life has *departed* before it is laid in the ground. But if we take this 'sowing' to refer not to our burial, but to the *origin* of our present mortal frame—to our *entrance* into this world, not our departure—then the apostle's language is clear and pertinent. We *are* sown—we are brought into this world—with animal frames, with bodies weak and tender, with bodies taken from the dust of the earth, and hastening every day to corruption; and with these, the imperishable and glorious body which Christ will give is fitly contrasted.

"What has put the idea of '*burial*' into some people's heads as the thought corresponding to *sowing*, is the 37th verse; and yet if you will look closely at that verse, you will perceive that it really makes the other way. 'That which thou sowest is not quickened (made alive), except it *die*.' The decomposition and breaking up of the structure of the seed, he calls, figuratively, its 'death:' it is like death—a kind of dissolution,—a great, and to a hasty observer a seemingly destructive, change that takes place. The apostle you will observe, does not say 'unless it corrupt,' but 'unless it *die*.' Nor does he call this change *dying*, unless he meant to compare it, not surely, with corruption, but with *death*. And if so, it is plain the thing corresponding with that change must be *our death*. The seed is first sown; and then dies; and then springs up again, And if this be applied to man's condition,—first *sown* into the world, then *dying*, and then *raised*; the comparison is intelligible and beautiful. But it will not at all agree with the case of a mere dead body. A corpse cannot die. It is dead already: dead

* Reply to the Bishop of Worcester. WORKS IV. p. 303. (Ed. 1812.)

Digitized by Google

before put into the earth. And therefore it would not have suited Paul's purpose to speak of it as a *dying* seed. It must be therefore our present animal living-frame that he speaks of as seed which must *die* before it can be quickened."*

And so Whitby: "The word '*sown*' doth not relate to the body's being lain in the earth, but rather to its production into the world; for when it is interred, it is no more an *animal* body but a body void of life; and is not only weak, but wholly destitute of power. And this appears yet further, from the following proof of these words, 'It is sown an animal body, . . . *for so it is written, The first man, Adam, was made a living soul.*' The Apostle doth indeed (vers. 36, 37) speak of seed sown in the earth, but then he speaks of it as still alive, and having its seminal virtue, or animal spirit in it, and after dying there; whereas our bodies first die, and then are cast into the earth."†

Regeneration is the quickening of this human seed, for then first the human spirit awakened from its dormant condition by nature, and becoming a participant in the Divine life, begins to clothe itself effectually in an immortal spiritual body, the earliest stages of the development of which, in this life, must be conceived of as proceeding rather by way of concentration of energy and condensation of substance than by mere superficial expansion of form, and as corresponding only to those of the natural body of the as yet unborn child. At death it may perhaps be said—holding to the analogy—that the spiritual body is *born*, yet not even then does it attain to the full development of its nature: there is, in all probability, a spiritual infancy in Hades even as there is a physical infancy on earth: we are here, most of us at least, spiritual embryos at best, and not till "the day of Jesus Christ" will the work of grace begun in us at regeneration be "perfected" (Phil. i. 6, *Greek*); when we shall be found wholly sanctified; in spirit and soul and body conformed to the image of God's Son.

Hence we conclude that the only "germ" existing in the human person—there is manifestly none such in the material body—which any way answers to the germ of the seed; and on which therefore we must suppose the Apostle's comparison to have been founded,—in perfect accordance, be it observed, with his statements in 2 Cor. iv. 16, and Rom. viii. 11,—is *the spiritual body itself;* and "the erroneous apprehensions which have sprung up on the subject, we think to have arisen from supposing the comparison to be based upon the condition of the two bodies—the vegetable and the animal—*after both are deposited in the dust.* Whereas the true view doubtless is, to conceive the germ of the plant to be developed *after* its consignment to the earth, but that of the body *before.*" On this supposition alone can the figure as used by the apostle be regarded as more than an apposite illustration.

Now the special value of this theory of the formation of the spiritual body, and the strongest evidence of its truth, is found in the fact that it enables us, as no other theory yet propounded does, to establish a casual relation, and hence an actual identity, between our present and our future, our natural and our spiritual body. We have already said that force or

* Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State.

† Commentary on the New Testament, *in loc.*

Digitized by Google

energy is the true substratum of what we call matter, and accordingly, on the hypothesis, the force or energy of the natural body being by the power of the *pneuma* on and through the *psyche*, communicated in part at least from the natural to the spiritual body, they are thus constituted fundamentally one; inasmuch as it may truly be said that the one is evolved during life *from* the other. Chemistry, we know, teaches us that the dark, opaque, and comparatively worthless piece of charcoal, and the resplendent, translucid, and costly diamond are composed essentially of one and the same element—carbon. If, then, we can conceive some of the atoms of a mass of charcoal being, by some unknown process, transferred to a diamond of the same size, so that as the former wasted the latter grew: we shall perhaps be better able to realise the theory of the formation of the spiritual body which we have been endeavouring to set forth, and at the same time to perceive that it involves an unbroken thread of continuity between the body of our earthly humiliation and that of our resurrection glory. Paul says, "If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual, . . . Howbeit the spiritual is not first but the natural, and afterward the spiritual, . . . and inasmuch as (καθώς) we bore the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." (1 Cor. xv. 44-49). But why this order,—*first* the natural, *afterward* the spiritual? In reply to this question Dr. Candlish says,—"This arrangement approves itself to the reflecting mind. It is according to the analogy of the whole procedure of God in creation and providence. The law of progression pervades and governs all divine operations. There is a true as well as a false theory of development. Consider the order in which God works as the Maker of all things. Beginning with mere matter, called into being out of nothing by his word, how does he give birth to successive forms of life in the vegetable and animal world, rising gradually from the lowest type of organisation, each new formation being an advance upon the preceding, until at last man appears upon the stage."* This is true, but not the whole truth. The divine order is, as we have seen, not only fit but inevitable, at all events in the case of man: the natural *must* precede the spiritual body, for the one grows as it were out of the other; and not more dependent is the plant upon the seed, or the butterfly upon the chrysalis, than—for the material of its development—is the spiritual upon the earthy body.

But another consideration is suggested by this theory of the formation of the spiritual body which is of a most practical and impressive character. The mysterious process is carried on indeed according to law, but it is at the same time under spiritual impulse. According as the action of the *pneuma* is weak or powerful, is aided or resisted by the *psyche*, will be the progress and the special character of the development of that "building from God, that house not made with hands" which is to be our habitation, nay, our very self to all eternity. The spiritual body is capable of being retarded in its growth, stunted in its stature, crippled and defiled for time and for eternity; but it is capable also of being renewed in strength and beauty from day to day. "Where the path of the Christian is like the shining light, shining more and more unto the perfect day, the interior, magnetic, or ethereal body, which is elaborated within us as truly as electricity or nerve-fluid,

* *Life in a Risen Saviour*, pp. 211 212.

Digitized by Google

flourishes in an inverse degree in proportion as the mortal body loses its powers and faculties, and succumbs to the untoward influences of advancing years. To use the language of the apostle, "Though our outward man perishes, our inward man is renewed day by day.'" But whatever may be its condition, stage of development, beauty of holiness or the lack, when the inevitable hour arrives, it will at once take the place of the dropped veil of flesh, and stand forth with shrinking shame or sublime serenity in the presence of a great host of spiritual witnesses *the perfect objective embodiment of the spiritual and moral character we have formed on earth.*

Yes, Christian reader, thus do we most literally, and day by day, by thought, and word, and deed, weave the "age-abiding," garment of our immortalised spirit. A "garment of glory and beauty," the finished pattern of which is shown us in heaven, even in the glorified humanity of Jesus, as Stephen saw him, at the right hand of God. But alas! what feeble "imitators of God" are we "though dear children." How often is the heavenly tissue dimmed and stained by sin, the perfect pattern deviated from by a wayward will, and the bright threads of blue and scarlet which should have gleamed most vividly amid the softer colours, cut by the violence of unhallowed passion. Blessed be God, his immutable purpose concerning every one of his children shall sooner or later be accomplished, and they will in spirit, soul, and body be "conformed to the image of his Son." But how keen the fire by which each earthly stain must be burnt out; how long and patient the toil by which alone each broken thread can be reknit; how terrible the discipline, it may be, ere the perfect pattern is reproduced: and meanwhile what shall even the holiest dare do more than echo the great poet's words:—

"As these white robes are soil'd and dark,
To yonder shining ground;
As this pale taper's earthly spark,
To yonder argent round;
So shows my soul before the Lamb,
My spirit before Thee;
So in mine earthly house I am,
To that I hope to be."

In our next paper we shall speak of the consummation of the resurrection in relation to the materialism of the new earth, without which the theory we have advocated would not differ substantially from that of *the spiritual body* which we previously, in a certain sense, rejected.

Florence Villa, North Finchley, N. W. MAUDE.

CHERUBIC PHENOMENA.

By WILLIAM MORRIS, M.D.

SECOND SECTION.

The Cherubim in the Most Holy Place of the Mosaic Tabernacle.

IT would appear that the knowledge of the cherubim survived the Noachian deluge, and was preserved in the Abrahamic branch of the line of Shem, unto the days of Moses. In the Mosaic writings they are

Digitized by Google

not particularly described. A model of the Tabernacle was shown to Moses "in the mount," and the specifications given to him were both comprehensive and minute; but therein the cherubim are no otherwise described than in that which relates to their oneness with the mercy-seat, the position of their extended wings, and the direction of their faces towards the mercy-seat. By these particulars, however, their symbolic relations to the divine government over Israel were clearly intimated and made known.

Jehovah was the tribal God of the Israelites by virtue of his promises to Abraham. He became their national King by the institution of a conditional covenant, enforced by the sanctions of peremptory law. But, within forty days from the date of its proclamation, the national covenant was broken by an idolatrous violation of the divine law. If, therefore, the LORD would not destroy the nation, some modification of the national government must needs be introduced. And even before the law was broken Moses had been instructed of the LORD, concerning a tabernacle which should be the administrative centre of a modified theocracy;* the honour of which should be, ostensibly, sustained by means of a system of expiatory sacrifice for the annulment of sins; and thus, for a consistent exercise of clemency and mercy by Israel's righteous king.

The tabernacle which was thus ordained, and was constructed and sanctified, to be the tent of the pilgrim God, was "a parable for the time then present"—παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ἐνεστηκότα. It included a fourfold system of representations; consisting of intelligible hieroglyphics,† governmental requirements, prophetic intimations, and sacrificial contrasts; the typical significance, and the interpretation of which should be made known "when the fulness of the time" should have arrived. But our present theme includes one, only, principal part in the hieroglyphic or symbolic department of that orderly arranged—κοσμικον—sanctuary. The "cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat" is our theme.

It is readily and necessarily conceivable that the central residence of the manifestive glory of the Godhead was anterior to the creation of the universe. And when the LORD instructed Moses concerning the appointments of the sacred tent, those pertaining to the holy of holies—the presence chamber and throne room of Israel's God and King—were the first described; namely, the ark with the mercy-seat and the cherubim.

The ark may be said to have been a *cubiform* chest, although the length

---

* The tabernacle being the constituted centre of the Theocratic administration, both the bestowment of blessing and the execution of judgment, are consequently said to come out from the presence of the LORD: and the style of expression in apostolic times was, in certain instances, governed by that usage. For example: "When the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." And again: "Who shall be punished with eternal destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

† Each several material, and colour, and combination, and arrangement—included in the tabernacle and its furniture and sacred inclosure, and in the vestures of the high priest and the priests—had a hieroglyphic or symbolic significance; intelligible to the people, as to the then present and governmental intent; and which must needs be understood by us, in order to a correct understanding of the *typical* import of each, and of the whole; and thus to the true interpretation of that ancient and elaborate parable.

Digitized by Google

exceeded the breadth and the height; the length being two cubits and a half; and the breadth and height, each, one cubit and a half. It was made of the "shittim wood"—the *Mimosa nilotica* of Linnæus: and, both within and without, it was completely encased in plates of gold; and was surmounted with an ornate cornice of pure gold. The cover of the ark, that is, the mercy-seat, was made of pure wrought gold; and of the same mass of pure gold the cherubim were formed, and were constituted the heraldic supporters of the throne. With their faces prone towards the middle of the mercy-seat, and their mantling wings shadowing it above, they were, also, the symbolic conservators of the sheh-cheinal glory of the LORD the King.

With reverent mind we may now entertain the conception of a position within the holy of holies. On the north, the south, and the west sides are the golden walls: above is the curtain which is called, *ha-mish-kan—the dwelling;* and is composed of cherubic designs, embroidered in blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen: and on the east side, suspended on golden pillars, with hooks of gold, is "the vail," which separates between the holy place, and the most holy: and this also is composed of cherubic designs, in blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen. And in the centre stands the ark with the mercy-seat and the cherubim, together constituting the throne of the LORD of hosts.

We have previously shown that the cherubic phenomena entabernacled at the tree of life, indicated ideas of the executive attributes and powers of the living God: and the impression thereby produced is deepened through a consideration of the Mosaic cherubim, and their relations to the throne and government of the LORD over the nation of Israel,—relations which were well-known to that nation, and noticed in national and inspired song, in such words as these: "Jehovah reigneth; let the people tremble: he sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth totter." And we now observe that the executive significance of the cherubim is exemplified in the administrative history of Moses—the *vice roi* of Jehovah in the camp of Israel. In his administration, the attributes of commanding intelligence, repressive power, destructive might, and intense benevolence, were marvellously associated, and practically exemplified. And in personal character and official conduct, Moses was a lively type; but this fact was an element of the "parable for the time then present."

Further: The symbolic intent of the Mosaic cherubim leads to a particular consideration of the theocratic government over Israel, as modified by the clemency and mercifulness of the Divine Sovereign; and ostensibly based on a system of expiatory offerings for the annulment of sin. For, in the governmental particulars symbolised by the cherubim, the cardinal principles of Mosaic jurisprudence are involved: the crowning characteristic of which is that, "mercy glorieth against judgment." Nevertheless, in that jurisprudence effectual provision was made for maintaining the honour of the divine government, and for the vindication of its righteous demands, against all iniquity, transgressions, and sin.

a. The legal penalty for *lawless* sin was certain death. A reprieve was not possible. "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses."

Lawless sin was an act of disobedience, committed with a clear understanding and remembrance of the law which was thus broken, and an

Digitized by Google

intention to break that law. In the legal records of Moses, such iniquity is described as being done with presumptuous pride and haughtiness, and with uplifted hand,—an intentional and defiant act of rebellion against the law and government of the LORD, the rightful and righteous King of Israel.

To use an extreme illustration, it was as if a presumptuous Israelite had broken into the tabernacle, passed within "the vail," and with uplifted hand had defied the majesty and might of him who abode between the cherubim. And upon the principle of honour and right, such an one must die without mercy, without reprieve. The Holy One —by reason of his regard for the honour and stability of his government, and for the well-being of his subjects—must destroy that daring rebel. An instance of such summary judgment is thus recorded:—"And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the LORD, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the LORD, and devoured them; and they died before the LORD."

b. For sins committed through inadvertency, or from exuberance of passional force, remission was provided. The Hebrew word—*sh'-gah-gah* —which in this connection is translated "ignorance," does not mean without a knowledge of the law. The ideal of that word signifies, to increase, to luxuriate, and consequently to become inclined to err or go astray. Its formal usage is intended to describe the state of one, who from increase or excess of physical and passional force, was mentally turbid, and hence was prone to do evil or commit sin. The word, therefore, denotes inadvertency, in contrast with a deliberate and daring intention to sin; and the difference and contrast implied may be thus illustrated: the mental condition of the lawless transgressor was like clear water, with a corrupt sediment beneath: but the mental condition of him who sinned through exuberance of passional energy, was like water, with a gross sediment stirred up and pervading the mass.

"The LORD is a God of knowldge, and by him actions are weighed." He "knew what was in man," took into account the inherited sinfulness of the Israelites, his subjects, and provided for them, individually, an ordinance for the remission of their sins, committed through the turbulence of innate evil. But, in the provision thus made, the honour of his government was secured, and the inadvertency of the transgressor was punished. For, the mode of remission secured an open and practical confession of the sin: and in the manner of making that confession, the offender was mulcted or deprived of a part of his property,—an ox, or a sheep, or a lamb,—the sin-offering required on the occasion, including the idea and fact of a fine imposed, and thus of a punitive deprivation. Moreover, the confession made by the slaying of the sin-offering, included an acknowledgment of the just and final desert of sin. The life of the offering was taken and destroyed. The representative victim perished. The destructive nature and due desert of sin were thus confessed. "The wages of sin is death."

c. The most impressive provision, ordained of the LORD, the King of Israel, for the remission of sins, was the annual solemnity commonly called "the day of atonement," the *yohm-kip-por* of the Jews, held in remembrance by them until this day. On that occasion the sins of the

Digitized by Google

nation, committed during the year then past, were remitted—were ceremonially and symbolically confessed, and were annulled.

It is permissible that we should conceive of the scenes and events of that day, as if they were now transpiring in our view. *There*, in the court of the tabernacle, is Aaron the high-priest: and near the altar are the bull and the goat, bound and ready to be slain. In the first instance, the high-priest disrobes, and lays aside his garments which were "for glory and for beauty." He bathes in the waters of the laver, derived from the smitten rock. He puts on the holy linen garments, appointed to be worn on that occasion; and emblematic of purity and comeliness in a state of humiliation.

With a keen, bright blade in one hand and a metallic bowl in the other, he moves towards the bull. By one effectual gash he lays open the arterial system of the animal at the throat. The bull is slain. His life blood is received in the bowl. And this slaughter of the bull is for the annulment of the sins of the high-priest, and of his sacerdotal household.

Now, with a censer filled with fire from the altar in one hand and the bowl of blood in the other, he goes into the tabernacle, and passing through the holy place, he enters "within the vail." *There* is the ark with the mercy-seat and cherubim, the throne of the Divine King of Israel. The high-priest puts incense on the fire in the golden censer, and a fragrant cloud covers the mercy-seat. Aaron moves, and now stands in front of the throne. With his finger he sprinkles the blood of the sin-offering upon and before the mercy-seat, seven times. Having so done, he withdraws and returns to the court of the tabernacle. In like manner, as he slew the bull, he now slays the goat, and receives its life-blood in the bowl. This he does for the annulment of the sins of the nation. Again he enters into the holiest with blood, which he sprinkles upon and before the mercy-seat seven times: and having done so, he finally withdraws, and is again in the sacred court. While he is yet there, we must consider the forensic intent of the solemn events which we have now observed.

When the high-priest slew the sin-offerings, he thereby made a symbolic confession for himself, his household, and the nation, that, on account of their sins, they deserved to die and to perish. And when, in the most holy place, he sprinkled the blood of those slain victims upon and before the mercy-seat, he completed and confirmed the confession which he had solemnly made. At the same time, and by the same acts, he recorded, upon and before the mercy-seat, *the proof* that the sin-offerings had been slain; and that, by the will and appointment of the Divine Sovereign, the sins of himself, his household, and the nation, had been annulled.

A second scene is now present to our view. The high-priest comes outside the court of the tabernacle, where stands a live goat—that which had been appointed to be the "scape-goat,"—and on the head of which Aaron lays both his hands; while he confesses—in the aggregate—the iniquities, transgressions, and sins of the whole nation, "putting them upon the head of the goat." *Now*, he sends away the scape-goat, by the hand of a fit man, to a far off wilderness, never more to be known. The annulment of the sins of the nation, effectuated by the high priest in pri-

Digitized by Google

vate, and alone with the LORD, has now been, symbolically and publicly, shown and declared.

But a third scene awaits us outside the camp.. *There* are the bodies of the victims whose blood had been borne into the most holy place by the high priest. They are laid upon the wood to be burned. The fire is kindled and vehemently burns. They are utterly consumed. Only the ashes remain. And thus—as if declared in words of fire—the revealed desert and final end of sin is exemplified and confirmed.

We have witnessed the great events of *yohm-kip-por*. And it must now be observed that the English word "atonement," does not properly represent the Hebrew term *kah-phar*, the ideal of which signifies to efface, to obliterate, and to annul. It is first met with in the history of the deluge; and by its use, Noah was instructed of God to cover the ark within and without with bitumen, and thus to efface and annul the seams thereof; and, by so doing, to exclude judgment and death, and preserve the lives of himself and those who were with him in the ark.

In a somewhat similar way the word is used to denote the obliteration and annulment of a supposed covenant, thus: "Your covenant with death shall be annulled." Moreover, its derivative, *kap-poh-reth*' means a covering; and, with the sign of the definite article prefixed, is translated "the mercy-seat." The tables of the broken law and covenant had been deposited in the ark, and were thus underneath the mercy-seat. And, upon the day of annulment, the LORD, the King of Israel, looked not from between the cherubim on the violated law, but had respect to the blood upon and before the mercy-seat: and the nation still lived, and was blessed by him whose "mercy endureth for ever."

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

DEAR SIR,—The extension of the knowledge of this truth, that immortality is not a natural and inalienable quality of the human soul, but a gift of divine grace, is an object of such great importance, that all who perceive it must be desirous to avoid every obstacle that might raise a prejudice against it.

Allow me, therefore, to submit to the advocates of this truth, the question, whether the use of the word, "conditional" to define their view of immortality, is not open to objection, as likely to create in some minds, a prejudice against the doctrine it is employed to designate.

Those who in the Conference of last year, and in the pages of the RAINBOW, have elucidated this doctrine, declare that endless life is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord; and that none but those who are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and sanctified by the Spirit of our God will live for ever. It may be strictly correct to use the word "conditional" to distinguish this view of immortality, taking it to signify that a certain condition, or state of mind, is necessary to fit a person for endless life. But the words "condition"

Digitized by Google

and "conditional" have played such a part in the theological controversies of British Christianity, that to many minds they suggest other ideas than that of fitness. A condition precedent is inconsistent with the idea of a free gift, and the use of the term "conditional" as characteristic of "immortality" may therefore suggest to the minds of those whose views of truth have been formed in the study of Puritan Theology, the supposition that the advocates of "Conditional Immortality" have not a clear understanding of the freeness of the gift of God.

Such a supposition is unjust; but from the actual history of the words, it is not unnatural. A long line of the clearest thinkers on the Calvinistic side have reasoned against the introduction of the term "condition" as understood by Arminians. Such assertions as that God gives salvation on condition of repentance and faith, have been overwhelmed with argument by men like Ebenezer Erskine and Augustus Toplady. They have taught us that the great difference between the covenant of Sinai, which "genders to bondage," and the new covenant of which Jesus is the Mediator, and which imparts freedom to the soul, is this,—that in the first covenant blessing is promised upon condition of obedience, and in the new covenant blessing is bestowed for Christ's sake only. The promise at Sinai was, "If ye will obey my voice, I will bless you." This condition has not been fulfilled, as a condition precedent; and blessing has never been obtained in the terms of that covenant. But in the new covenant, God saith, "Ye shall be my people, and I will be your God;" and this "not for your sakes, but for mine holy Name's sake."

On the turning point of the long controversy between conditional and unconditional promises and gifts, many of us believe that Oliver Cromwell and his spiritual teachers John Owen and John Howe were right; and their faith in the everlasting covenant of unconditional promises, the utterances of free grace, was to them a source of spiritual strength in life and in death. And whatever dogmas of the Puritans may pass away before the advancing light of a new era,—they will always be a blessed people who cherish such clear views as those noble Puritans attained of the covenant of grace, and who are able to say, as David did,—"He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure." And it is not necessary to go back to the Puritans for illustration of that mode of faith to which the word "conditional" is objectionable. The Church of England daily proclaims the unconditional freeness of the gifts of God, in the sound words of one of her collects, "O God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed." This expression of faith in Divine grace leaves no room for the idea of conditions precedent to the grant of Divine blessings. And that hymn of welcome for poor sinners to Christ will not be obsolete for many generations yet, in which the assurance has been often given that—

> "All the fitness he requireth,
> Is to feel your need of him;
> This he gives you,
> 'Tis his Spirit's rising beam."

Thus, in the first invitation to a sinner poor and wretched, a preacher of the Gospel often finds it necessary to assure him that there is no condition to be fulfilled by him before receiving, as the free gift of God, life and immortality in Christ.

Digitized by Google

Now, why should needless offence be given to any of those who rest in the assurance of salvation bestowed unconditionally, by the grace of God, through Jesus Christ? In consequence of the actual experience of the English-speaking part of the Church of Christ, the terms "Conditional Immortality" suggest to some minds a departure from the faith that God has freely given us eternal life. Would it not be well, in the new nomenclature required for the elucidation of truth newly cleared from the obscurity of unwarrantable tradition, to avoid the very appearance of evil? There are prejudices enough to be overcome before the great majority of Christians can be induced to consider the questions submitted to them by those who believe that the Son of God will, according to his revealed purpose, destroy all the works of the devil, and bring the universe into subjection to himself. It is not well to use a term at which many stumble, when another would express the design of those who hold this view quite as clearly.

Without venturing to fix on any one designation as the best that could be adopted, I would ask you to consider whether one of these designations might not be used with advantage to the cause, instead of "Conditional Immortality," namely, "The Immortality of the sanctified," "The Immortality of the blessed," "Holy Immortality," "Blessed Immortality," "The attainment of Immortality," "The bestowment of Immortality," "The gift of Immortality," "Immortality in Christ."

This last suggestion comes near to the entirely unobjectionable designation adopted long ago by the Rev. Edward White, "Eternal life in Christ only." Why not adhere to that? At all events, it would be well to give up the term "conditional," as needlessly suggestive of a controversy not involved in the question we press on the attention of our fellow Christians.

I am glad to find, by recent indications, that the truth regarding the Divine purpose to deliver the universe from evil, and as to the origin of man's immortality, is gaining ground in this country.

Yours, in Christ,

WILLIAM RIDLEY.

Sydney, Australia.

IN DEFENCE OF KING DAVID.

DEAR SIR,—With your permission, I should like to make a few observations in reply to Mr. Deacon's reference, in the September RAINBOW, to David's dying charge to Solomon regarding Shimei. (1 Kings ii. 9.) My former letter, calling attention to the different rendering given by Kennicott, Parkhurst, &c., was intended rather for such of your readers as were not aware of what those eminent Hebraists had to say on the subject, than for Mr. Deacon himself, whom it was natural to suppose already familiar with their criticisms. But I am glad to have called forth a statement of Mr. Deacon's reasons for setting aside their explanation as untenable. At the same time I am not a little surprised at the tenor of some of his remarks.

I observe that he does not venture to dispute the possibility of the correctness of the proposed rendering, nor even that it derives "apparent support from the manner in which Solomon dealt with Shimei." In order, however, to do away with this "apparent support," and to sustain the painful charge against the aged king, of having

Digitized by Google

in his dying moments instigated his son to a cold-blooded and treacherous breach of his own solemn oath, he has recourse to a constructive charge against Solomon of too ready complicity in the (alleged) heartless advice of his father. But I am afraid the version of Solomon's dealings on which he bases this accusation will scarcely bear examination, being neither consistent with itself nor with the written record. For example, he says that, "instead of putting Shimei under restraint," Solomon left him "absolutely free, only exacting an oath that he should not leave Jerusalem." What can be Mr. Deacon's notions of the meaning of *restraint* and *liberty?* A man left "absolutely free," and yet forbidden *under pain of death* (for that was the purport of his oath) to go beyond a very circumscribed area! That man must be curiously constituted who would not feel himself very much under restraint indeed in such circumstances. Moreover, adds Mr. Deacon, "we are not told that the oath was ever *renewed*." But is this fair? Where is there a hint in the narrative of the oath having *expired*, or requiring to be renewed? Apart from any specified restriction as to time, it certainly looks as if it was intended to be a life-long obligation on Shimei's part, especially when he, now a very old man, was bidden *build a house* within the precincts to which he was confined. Again, Mr. Deacon speaks of the young king laying a "trap" for the life of "the old sinner." Does he mean that Solomon had some hand in getting Shimei's chattels to run away, and so entice their master to go beyond the limits prescribed by his oath? If not, pray wherein was the "trap?" and what warrant is there for him to speak of subsequent events as the "success" of the king's "plans?" The only "design" which the record mentions that Solomon cherished in the matter was a determination to put Shimei to death the instant he broke his parole. But so far from his designs being "sinister," as Mr. Deacon calls them, he distinctly warned their object of them beforehand, and for aught the narrative contains, the prisoner, being fully forewarned, might, by strict observance of his oath, have defied the "plans," and died peacefully in his bed. "Surely in vain the net is spread *in the sight* of any bird" (Prov. i. 17), is a word of Solomon himself; and if he had still to learn its truth, it is time we were revising the current views of his pre-eminent sagacity. But besides all this, why all that trouble laying plans to entrap the man's life, if the "identity of intention" in David's instructions for which Mr. Deacon contends, would have warranted a speedier method of action? There was an undeniable *contrast* in Solomon's dealings with the two men, Joab and Shimei. On the supposition that David issued orders regarding them of identical import, as our common version of 1 Kings ii. 6-9 seems to say, this contrasted action is hard to explain. But on the improved version being adopted, Solomon's conduct is seen to have been quite in harmony with his instructions as they will then read. Joab, whose life had been long since forfeit, was, with a severity which I am not presently concerned to pronounce upon, condemned to pay the legal penalty of his misdeeds; Shimei, who might also legally have been slain as one who had "cursed the ruler of his people," was, in consideration of David's solemn oath, to be spared, but carefully watched as a seditious

Digitized by Google

person likely to give trouble to the young king: "Hold him not guiltless; but his hoar head bring thou NOT down to the grave with blood." I maintain that Solomon did respect both his father's oath and advice, until a *fresh* offence brought its own doom upon the head of Shimei. His action may have been stern but was not treacherous or "sinister." I leave your readers to judge which theory of the young king's conduct is the more open to the charge of "importing artificial and improbable" suppositions into the narrative.

In conclusion, I would say that while I do not feel bound to defend every action of the "saints" of the ancient regime, or to condone their faults; as little am I disposed to put the worst possible construction on every incident in their lives in order to give enhanced approval to the moral standard of the later Revelation. The very knowledge, therefore, that it was possible, on high authority, to give a rendering of 1 Kings ii. 9, which would clear the grand old Israelitish monarch of the painful charge involved in our common version, and that such a change of rendering was, to say the least, quite reconcilable with Solomon's recorded action, would have led me to give the accused the "benefit of the doubt," and to refrain from building theories as to the imperfect development of his conscience upon a foundation which might turn out to be only a cruel misconception.

I hope (D.V.) next month to offer a few remarks on the other point on which I have presently the misfortune to differ with Mr. Deacon, viz., David's relation to the curses of Psalm cix.

Yours sincerely,
M. W. STRANG.

AN OLD QUESTION.

SIR,—I think the question raised by "An Inquirer," was put by the disciples of old to our Lord when they said, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" And instead of answering that question, Christ addressed to them that memorable exhortation: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate, &c." Nor was this the only time when our Lord distinctly repressed curiosity respecting the future salvation of other men. Ought we not therefore to leave this matter altogether in His hands? Where Christ is silent, ought any one to speak decisively? I enclose my card for your private information, and am your obedient servant, J. M.

MR. WHITE'S LETTERS.

DEAR SIR,—I have had the pleasure of reading the pamphlet entitled, "Life and Death," consisting of letters to the *Christian World*, by the Rev. E. White and S. Minton. While I thoroughly agree with their conclusions, and with most of the grounds on which they are based, I should yet like, with your permission, to take objection to some expressions in the former series of letters, which appear to me to offer a needless obstruction to the acceptance of the Truth. Though I have not yet had the advantage of reading Mr. White's larger work, I am aware how high his authority stands in this question, and I cannot but feel that any criticism from so feeble a pen as mine must have the appearance of presumption. I will plead in excuse that I have myself published two pamphlets on the subject, viz., "The Eternities of Scripture" (1866), and "Man's Claim to Immortality" (1871), of both of which I sent you copies last year. If this gives me a right to be heard,

Digitized by Google

1. I would venture to express my amazement to see this statement in Mr. White's third letter: that "unless men are born twice they will die twice." Where, I ask, is the reason, and where is the Scripture for so paradoxical an assertion? The form of the expression seems to imply that there is the same relation between the second Birth and the second Death as there is between the first of each. But the actual meaning (I take it) must be this, that, while natural death is the ultimate consequence of natural birth, spiritual death will be the consequence of the *want* of spiritual birth! If this be the writer's meaning (and I can imagine no other), the analogy is surely somewhat awry.

The only justification for the statement in question would be the supposition that the second birth gives a charter of immortality, though the first does not: an idea which seems to me quite as absurd and unscriptural as that which Mr. White so ably combats. And if it *be* the meaning, it surely should not be assumed in the teeth of Catholic belief without an attempt at proof. In any case, the idea has certainly damaged the logic of the sentence: and in my opinion it has very seriously impaired the soundness of the argument.

2. I also think that Mr. White makes a needless and dangerous concession to the adversary in using the words "eternal," "everlasting," "for ever," as if they necessarily signified "without end." Surely if they do, then Matt. xxv. 46 too plainly proves an endless punishing. For κολασις denotes an incomplete action, and if αἰωνιος positively excludes completion, the cause is lost,—the sinner must endlessly endure his pain.

Would it not be better, in arguing this question, to abstain from using the ambiguous words "eternal" and the like, and to deny "endless," but not "eternal" punishment, rendering αἰωνιος, as many writers in the RAINBOW have done, by some such word as "age-long" or "enduring?" There is certainly nothing in the word (in spite of Aristotle) which excludes an end, and therefore we can have no right to express or imply any such exclusion in our interpretation of it. I think Mr. White's undoubted love of accuracy and truth will persuade him of this, on re-consideration.

3. I would plead for a still more decided allowance of the theism so well described in page 51, which has come nearer than anything I have seen to what I have been long looking for: a definition of Matter (if indeed it be capable of definition). It seems to me that any definition can only be provisional, and varying with our means of measuring physical forces; and since no finite intellect can possibly fathom infinity, it is therefore impossible to fix an outside limit to the matter which envelopes us—impossible to draw a line of demarcation between purest matter and spirit itself. The beautiful lines quoted from Milton, harmonise with this idea. I should much like to see it drawn out in a philosophical manner.

A. H. H.

Literature.

A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament, together with an Index of Greek words, and several Appendices. By the Rev. Ethelbert W. Bullinger, St. Stephens, Walthamstow. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1877.

THIS is a work of great and permanent value, the result of nine years

Digitized by Google

labour, and we are certain it will not be labour lost. As soon as the volume is known it will take its proper place as a standard book of reference in the libraries of students.

We have carefully examined a number of test words, the exact meaning of which is essential to a true theology,—such as life, death, hades, hell, heaven, paradise, and the like,—and are thankful to report that Mr. Bullinger has given us a Scripture Dictionary which deserves hearty commendation. We are grateful to find that the learned compiler takes exactly our view of the so-called intermediate state, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Lord's answer to the penitent thief, and the time of the paradise.

The author's description of the book is as follows: "This work is dedicated to, and designed for, all English Bible students, and is so arranged as to be understood also by those who are unacquainted with Greek. It shows at a glance the Greek word with its literal meaning for every English word in the text or margin of the New Testament; all the various readings of the Greek with the critical authorities; and all proper names that are affected by various readings. It also contains an index of Greek words with all their renderings, and the number of times each rendering occurs; and the following appendices: (*a*) All the various readings that are involved in longer clauses; (*b*) the Greek alphabet, with the powers, &c., of the letters, &c.; tables of the endings of verbs, nouns, and adjectives, as illustrating and determining their signification; (*c*) a list of the variations in the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus."

Life and Death. London: Elliot Stock.

Mr. White's reply to Mr. Baldwin Brown on the great question of immortality, and Mr. Minton's letters on the same subject, are here reprinted from the *Christian World*, in a neat sixpenny pamphlet, which will no doubt secure, as it deserves, many readers.

Lightning Flashes; or, Outspoken Truths to Professors of Religion. By Silas Henn. London: Elliot Stock.

Mr. Henn is very much in earnest, and there are many things in his volume fitted to stimulate Christian zeal; but when an author calls his own book "Lightning Flashes," critics must be careful what they say.

Rev. Joseph Cook's Monday Lectures. London: R. D. Dickenson.

This gentleman is a great orator who has been taking the intellect of Boston, U.S., by storm. There are splendid rhetorical passages in these lectures, and his criticisms on Emerson and Parker are keen as the point of a lance. There are, however, certain things in his theology which we do not accept.

NOTICE.

Back Volumes of the Rainbow.—The Publisher has a few volumes of the Rainbow for 1875 and 1876, which he is willing to dispose of at 4s. 6d. each. Early application is necessary, as only a few copies are to be had at this rate, and the orders will be executed as they arrive. Application, accompanied by a P. O. Order, must be made direct to Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

NOVEMBER, 1877.

THE IMMOVABLE KINGDOM.

IN the epistle to the Hebrews the apostle writes: "Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear. For our God is a consuming fire." The connective particle "wherefore" points to what goes before, where there is mention made of certain things that may be shaken, and which are to be removed. There is thus an evident contrast between the movable and the immovable—the movable applying to present things, and the immovable to that divine kingdom which the faithful are to receive —not "having received," as some would have the words to be read; but "receiving;" not yet received, but possibly in the then near future.

The apostle, in alluding to the things to be shaken, makes a quotation from the prophecy of Haggai, as follows: "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven," and he adds: "And this word, 'yet once more,' signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." He then immediately proceeds to give the exhortation already quoted: "Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved," &c. The word "moved" might well have been rendered "shaken" here, as in verse 27, as the same word in the original is used in both places. The idea however is the same, namely, that of permanence and stability as contrasted with "the removing of shaken things" the apostle had just mentioned.

The words quoted from Haggai are evidently abridged and slightly altered. The full passage is as follows: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come." (Haggai ii. 6, 7.) At verse 21, the prophet repeats the prediction with a little varia-

Digitized by Google

tion, "Speak to Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, saying, I will shake the heavens and the earth; and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms; and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen (or nations); and I will overthrow the chariots and those that ride in them; and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother. In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, the son of Shealtiel, saith the Lord, and I will make thee as a signet; for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts." It must be evident to every one that there is here both physical and political shaking. First, "the heavens, earth, sea, and dry land." Then "all nations." Those who make the heavens and the earth signify rulers and ruled, must acknowledge that here the heavens and earth are mentioned in conjunction with "all nations," and yet in a separate category. So that the physical shaking of the heavens and earth is not to be explained away as merely descriptive of the political.

This being so, it follows that the partial quotation made by the apostle while it must embrace all that the prophecy contains, must especially include the physical, because the quotation expressly mentions it. But the fact that he speaks of it as a promise, must be held to imply the whole, and especially because he sets in contrast with it the receiving of the immovable kingdom.

But the apostle gives no indication that the physical and political convulsions predicted by Haggai had taken place, far less the promised coming of the Desire of all nations, and the consequent "giving of peace." Dr. Hales gives a rendering of verses, 6-9 of Haggai ii. which puts the matter in a stronger light as regards the future fulfilment of the prediction :—

> Thus saith the Lord of hosts;
> Yet once more shortly will I shake
> The heavens and the earth,
> The sea and the dry land,
> And I will shake all nations,
> And the DESIRE of all nations shall come,
> And I will fill this house with glory,
> Saith the Lord of hosts.
> The silver is mine, and the gold is mine,
> Saith the Lord of hosts;
> The glory of this house (at) the last
> Shall be greater than at the first,
> Saith the Lord of hosts;
> And in this place will I give peace,
> Saith the Lord of hosts.

He adds, "Christ is here styled the Desire of all nations, a title founded in the Abrahamic covenant, that in him should all the nations of the earth be blessed. He was therefore the earnest and anxious expectation of the whole world from Abraham's days. (John viii. 5, 6; Luke x. 24.) Hence, Titus was styled by the adulation of the Romans hailing him as the promised Messiah, 'the delight of mankind.'"

Digitized by Google

Whether this be deemed satisfactory or not, there can be no doubt that all nations have felt the need of such blessedness as shall only be bestowed by the one seed of Abraham. The nations of the European continent might safely be given as illustrative of this feeling. There is no contentment with things as they are, especially with absolute sovereignty, modified though it be in some cases by the forms of constitutional government. With many, the remedy is Republicanism; but surely the most modern instance on a large scale—the United States of America—does not promise a very great advance, if any at all, upon limited monarchy as exemplified in Great Britain for instance, if we take the two blessings of order and liberty into consideration; while the slow and cumbrous machinery of legislative reform, even in the best governed nation, shows how needful is some depository of wisdom and power and goodness to meet the requirements of humanity, even in a political aspect. This pressing need will find adequate compensation in the administration to be inaugurated by the Prince of peace. Thus, whether wittingly or not, the nations will realise in him their highest aspirations after good government, and he will prove to have been in reality "the Desire of all nations."

Instability and mutability have thus been stamped on all the nations of modern Europe, with the exception of Britain and Russia. These nations have preserved a continuous existence, under one form of government, for upwards of a thousand years. But it is only within a comparatively recent period that even they have attained to any great magnitude as nations. The other nations of Europe have for the most part sprung from the breaking up of the Roman empire which took place at the close of the fourth century of our era.

But even if we extend our retrospect beyond the division of the Roman empire referred to, and survey the condition of the ancient world, we shall find a large amount of the same tendency to change. Rome occupied the position of a universal empire for less than five hundred years. Rome was founded about the time when Isaiah began to deliver his prophecies, that is, rather more than 750 years before the birth of Christ, and when the nation of Israel had been constituted a divine kingdom for nearly a similar period. During the first seven hundred years of the history of Rome, no fewer than five forms of government are said to have obtained, the imperial forming the sixth. The commonwealth was by no means free from civil war during this period.

But Rome was not the first universal empire. It is well known to even cursory readers of ancient history that the short-lived Macedonian empire under Alexander the Great was in its time all but as extensive as the succeeding Roman dominion itself. At the death of Alexander, his empire was divided among his four generals, and in this condition it existed for nearly three hundred years, when it became absorbed in the Roman. At the accession of Alexander, we

Digitized by Google

reach a point about 330 B.C., whence we extend our view backwards upon the Medo-Persian power which was established by Cyrus and Darius about B.C. 538, on the ruins of what may properly be called the first universal dominion in the world—the empire of Babylon. But Babylon itself was originally a portion of the antecedent dominion of Assyria. It was this Babylonish division of Assyria that, under Nebuchadnezzar, attained to universal dominion, absorbing even the greater part of Assyria itself into its dominion. We have an account of this in the conquest of Judea by Babylon, as well as various other nations which were all brought under subjection at the same time. And although there was a partial restoration of the Jews at the end of seventy years, the country remained tributory to the Babylonians, then, however, under the sway of the Medo-Persians.

In this rapid survey I have left out of sight Egypt and China, as occupying exceptional positions. It is a fact, however, that even Egypt shared the instability of the other countries mentioned, having successively formed part of the Macedonian and Roman empires, and is now subject to Turkey.

While making allusion to these successive universal dominions which have existed on the earth, we are reminded of an important intimation which was given regarding the immovable character of the divine kingdom which is to succeed them. In the interpretation given by Daniel of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar concerning the great image representing the four successive dominions referred to, he said: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; it shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and destroy all other kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." (Dan. ii. 44.) The fate of the first three kingdoms symbolised by the great image was that they were successively left to other people, or, as it has been otherwise rendered, "to another people." A different foreign power came in as the inheritor of the dominion of each preceding dynasty respectively; the last foreigner being the Roman. But this succession of a new people as the possessor of universal dominion was to terminate with the fourth kingdom. Subdivision and weakness, and ultimate destruction were to overtake it, although it was originally "strong as iron." But in opposition to all this display of mere human ambition grasping at sovereign rule, a kingdom of an entirely different character is announced. It is to be "set up" by "the God of heaven." It is not to pass from its first possessors to any "other people." It is "not to be destroyed," but, is on the contrary, "to destroy and break in pieces all other kingdoms, and to stand for ever." This is that "kingdom that cannot be moved" spoken of by the apostle. All others are to be removed to make room for it, and it is to occupy their place. This latter feature though not expressed, is implied in the statement of the prophet. And in another part of the same book in a vision seen by the pro-

Digitized by Google

phet himself, it is distinctly declared to have its locality "under the whole heaven."

But while all human kingdoms and governments of every form both past and present are characterised by instability, and while there can be no doubt that in some way the hand of God has been manifest in many of the vicissitudes which they have undergone, the shaking foretold by the prophets points to something of a more direct and visible character. Thus in Haggai the shaking of all nations, and overthrowing the throne of kingdoms is connected with physical phenomena as palpable and obvious as the display of the divine power which took place at Sinai, at the giving of the law. The apostle plainly affirms this in the passage in Hebrews. After giving a graphic outline of the scene at Sinai, he says: "Whose voice then shook the earth, but now he hath promised saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven." The coming convulsions are of similar character with that at Sinai, but evidently on a larger scale, inasmuch as not merely one people, but all nations shall be concerned; and not merely earth, but heaven as well, shall partake of the shaking. The period when this shall be fulfilled is described as an unprecedented time of trouble. A few quotations from the other prophets will serve to show the character of this unexampled epoch, and its relation to the immovable kingdom. It will be seen that the divine interference is of an extraordinary kind, and has for its direct object the introduction of a new order of things in connection with the reign of the Messiah upon the earth:—

"The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord. . . . Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up; and he shall be brought low: and upon all the cedars of Lebanon, that are high and lifted up, and upon all the oaks of Bashan, and upon all the high mountains, and upon all the hills

Digitized by Google

that are lifted up, and upon every high tower, and upon every fenced wall, and upon all the ships of Tarshish, and upon all pleasant pictures. And the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be made low: and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. And the idols he shall utterly abolish. And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats; to go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth." (Isaiah ii. 1-5; 10-21.)

"The earth shall reel to and and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage; and the transgression thereof shall be heavy upon it; and it shall fall, and not rise again. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." (Isaiah xxiv. 20-23.)

"Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." (Zech. xiv. 3-5.)

"The sun and moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more." (Joel iii. 15-17.)

"Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I arise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy. For then will I turn to the

Digitized by Google

people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent." (Zeph. iii. 8, 9.)

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble: therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the most High. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early. The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved: he uttered his voice, the earth melted. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations he hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted in the earth. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge." (Psalm xlvi.)

These quotations speak for themselves if people would only let them. They distinctly affirm that the coming of righteousness and peace is to be introduced by a direct divine interposition in human affairs, convulsing the whole fabric of political and ecclesiastical organisations, and setting up a kingdom of his own. I have abstained from going into the details, but the great outline is distinct enough for all practical purposes. Much harm has resulted to the cause of truth from speculative theories as to times and seasons, and also as to particular powers which are not named in prophecy, being treated as signs of the times. I entirely agree with the following notice of a work on prophecy in RAINBOW for September 1869:—

"Perhaps the greatest service to the cause of prophetic truth, and the truest help towards disarming the prejudice with which the whole subject is regarded even by good men, which a majority of writers on prophecy could render, would be *to write no more*. This seems no doubt a harsh saying; yet it cannot be denied that the crude, wild, ill-digested publications which have issued from the press during the last thirty years have done much to create and to perpetuate the prejudice we so much lament."

It is to be regretted that such a judgment is called for, and it were well that the lesson could be laid to heart even yet. But the human mind is impatient of the apparent delay which has taken place, and seeks to be wise above what is written. It misapplies the intimation: "the wise shall understand:" making it refer to a knowledge of chronological periods and sign events, when there is no ground for any such application in the message from which it is taken.

The fact that this kingdom is to be possessed by the faithful, and that its rightful king now speaks from heaven, is made the ground

Digitized by Google

of an exhortation by the apostle: "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh, for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth (from Mount Sinai), much more shall not they escape who turn away from him that speaketh from heaven. . . . Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear. For our God is a consuming fire." They escaped not who refused him that spake from Sinai. One whole generation fell in the wilderness from this very cause; for they could not enter in (to the promised land) through unbelief. The apostle mentions this in an earlier part of this epistle as a warning to the believing Hebrews. Individual instances are also instructive. Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord and devoured them; and they died before the Lord. And Moses said unto Aaron, "This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people will I be glorified." For rebellion against Moses as the chosen servant of God, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and all the men that appertained to them were swallowed by the earth, and went down alive into the pit; while "two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly famous in the congregation, men of renown" who had conspired with them, were at the same time consumed by fire from the Lord.

The apostle warns the Hebrew disciples that even greater severity should be exercised against disobedience under the Gospel than under the law. "Much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven." In a former part of this epistle, he says: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace." And again: "If the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?"

And although judgment under the Gospel is postponed to the future beyond the present life, it is not the less certain on that account. The *criteria* by which that judgment shall be determined are now being furnished. If we turn away now from him that speaketh from heaven, we shall not escape. We have no guarantee that an opportunity of listening to it shall be afforded in the next state. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment:" "He that rejecteth Me and receiveth not My word," saith the Lord himself, "hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day."

Digitized by Google

Let us "see then that we refuse not him that speaketh from heaven." If faithful and approved, we shall inherit the kingdom which cannot be moved, including "the things that cannot be shaken." Like that immovable kingdom, "he that doeth the will of God shall abide for ever." By nature the creatures of a day, whose very "foundation is in the dust," the inheritors of the kingdom shall, through Christ, be endued with immortality. The promise is: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God." And again: "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death."

The apostle seems to have had in mind the fate of Nadab and Abihu, and also the two hundred and fifty men of renown who conspired with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, when he penned the closing words of the warning we have been considering: "For our God is a consuming fire." They escaped not who refused the Divine speaker, much more shall not we if we turn away from him. "Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear; for our God is a consuming fire." Let the example of the rebellious be a warning to us, for the same God who spoke to them, speaks to us, and although he is as he always was, a God of love, he is also a consuming fire. The glad tidings concerning his kingdom, and the name of his Son, the Messiah of Israel, who gave his life a ransom for many, will be a savour of life unto life in them that are saved; but it will as truly be a savour of death unto death in them that perish. May all who read this magazine, seek and find that coming immovable kingdom, and rest assured that in so doing all other things shall be added to them.

Edinburgh, 4, Melville Terrace. J. CAMERON.

"THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

WITHIN a few pages of each other in Holy Writ these words are found, as it were in response to the words of the scoffer (2 Peter iii. 4), "Where is the promise of his coming, for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation." And every year that things continue as they are, the scoffer of the last days grows bolder, for there are those who are ready to say, "What about your things that were shortly coming to pass 1800 years ago?" Without caring, however, to answer the scoffer, it may be well to fortify our own faith and the faith of others by calling to mind that the term "shortly" in the mouth of God, and in the mouth of man, admits of widely different meanings. When he speaks, whose time for work is eternity, with

Digitized by Google

whom one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years no more than one day, we can well understand that when already four thousand years had sped their way, and but two thousand, more or less, remained—if our reckoning be admitted—to complete the world's history of sin and sorrow, the things which were to end that history were to him "things which must shortly come to pass."

It may be well then, in the brief space of time that yet remains, to consider these things in their nature, order, and design as set forth in the Scriptures of truth, that thereby our interest may be stirred, our faith strengthened, and our expectation quickened, that as wise virgins we may be found of him awake, with our lamps trimmed and burning when he comes.

What then of the "things which must shortly come to pass" may we look for as the *first* thing that is likely to happen? It is surely that which is to take place suddenly, coming at unawares, overtaking as a thief. "As it was in the days of Noah so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot, . . . even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed. I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed, the one shall be taken and the other left; two women shall be grinding together, one shall be taken and the other left; two men shall be in the field, one shall be taken and the other left;" showing that the same moment that it shall be night with some, early morning with others, and high day with others, something shall happen which shall be unique in the history of our race, some taken others left. Well might the disciples ask in astonishment, "Where, Lord?" *Whereto* shall they be taken? "And he said unto them, Wheresoever the body is, there also the eagles will be assembled." (Luke xvii. 27-37. *Emphatic Diaglott.*)

Now without staying to consider the many opinions advanced by the commentators, to whom this answer of our Lord has been a dark saying, we venture to suggest that the principles of attraction and concentration were all that our Lord intended to convey in the use of this figure, and that it was an equivalent for saying, "Where the head is, thither will the members be assembled." The Jewish mind would be already familiar with the emblem of eagles, as applied to God's elect people in Exodus xix. 4 and Deut. xxxii. 11. The attraction which Christ's bodily presence in the air will have for the raised and changed bodies of his saints will necessitate concentration according to that of Paul, Col. iii. 4, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory," and that of John (1 Ep. iii. 2), "We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." And to the Corinthians the apostle speaks yet more fully, concerning this time of separation, "Behold I show you a mystery, we shall

Digitized by Google

not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet"—not heard by the world, but only those for whom it is intended—"for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised, and we shall be changed." And again to the Thessalonians, "For this we affirm unto you by the Lord's word, that we, the living, who are left over to the coming of the Lord will by no means precede those who fell asleep. Because the Lord himself will come down from heaven with a shout, with an archangel's voice, and with God's trumpet, and the dead in Christ will be raised first, then we, the living who are left over, shall at the same time with them be caught away in clouds for a meeting of the Lord in the air, and so we shall be always with the Lord." (1 Thess. v. 15, 16, 17. *Emphatic Diaglott.*)

This then is the *first* of the things which must shortly come to pass; and now arises the question, Who are they that shall be so favoured? will it be the common lot of all the righteous at that time living on the earth or sleeping in their graves, or will it be an election out of and from among both the living and the sleeping? This is a question of great practical moment, and calls for a deep and prayerful research of the sacred oracles, that without indulging our fancy or favouring some doctrine or dogma of our own or other men's invention, we may earnestly and devoutly inquire, "What hath the Lord answered? and, What hath the Lord spoken?"

When, immediately following the words already quoted from Luke, as recorded by Matthew, we find our Lord saying, "Watch, therefore, for *ye* know not what hour *your* Lord doth come;" and again, "Therefore be *ye* also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh;" and again, "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins which took their lamps and went forth to meet the Bridegroom," it surely behoves *us* to consider whether the mind of our Lord expressed herein does not call *us* to the exercise of great heart-searching inquiry upon the matter of *readiness*. For let us observe that five of the virgins denoted as *wise* went in with the Bridegroom to the marriage, while the five denoted as *foolish* were shut out. And further let us note that the foolish were virgins, that they took lamps and went forth to meet the Bridegroom, and that when he came their lamps were still burning, for although our version reads, "gone out," Alford's version and others read, "going out," showing it to be a question of degree of oil, and not of destitution. But they knew where to get oil, and they went and obtained it, and returned only *too late*. And however threatening the Master's words, "I know you not," may sound, we must remember that there are various orders of knowledge, and since it cannot mean absolute ignorance, it may mean deficient complacency, and that some versions read, "I recognise you not," is certain. Equally certain is it that this parable was spoken to disciples, and contained a teaching for them which it had not for the multitude.

Digitized by Google

If then this is the first of the things which are shortly to come to pass, and we know not whether his coming may be to-day, two questions are supremely important. First, Wherein consists readiness? and next, Am I ready? for an individual matter as it is, an individual matter should we make it. Now, readiness to meet events of any kind which involve danger, consists in these three essentials—wakefulness, armour, and disentanglement. The watchman must be awake to see the thief coming, he must be armed in order to attack or defend, and moreover he must be free from all claims elsewhere, that he may obey the call of duty. So the good soldier or faithful steward must not be entangled with the affairs of this life that he may please him who hath called him into office. Readiness we understand to mean, continuing in his word, and *so* being his disciples indeed, carrying some cross for him, confessing him before men, walking with him in the path of self-denial, "doing all things without murmurings and disputings, that we may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke, shining as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life." Readiness also we understand to consist in "loving his appearing" (2 Tim. iv. 8), and "looking for him" (Heb. ix. 28) in the most literal sense of the word. Some indeed may know little or nothing of the doctrine. The appearing of our Lord and Saviour in the clouds may form no part of their creed; no idea of his near approach in person may ever have occurred to them, or been hinted to them by book, sermon, or friend; yet, if he is the chief joy of their hearts, and they love his appearing, and look for him in their closet, in their Bible, in all the means of grace; if their hearts beat at the mention of his name, and they love all those who love him, whatever sect, creed, or denomination they favour; such, without question, without exception, shall be found of the number concerning whom it is said, "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation," without a sin-offering unto salvation, "the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." (Rom. viii. 23.)

For all *such* an overcomer's crown is prepared, according to the apostle's words in anticipating his own, "And not for me only, but also for all such as love his appearing." And here we have an answer to the vexed question, often asked and seldom answered to satisfaction, Who comprise the bride, the Lamb's wife? We reply, "Such as look for him, such as love his appearing, such as go in with him to the marriage, will comprise the bride, the Lamb's wife." If this be true their number surely is small by comparison with the many saved. "Many are invited, but few are selected," is the reading of Matt. xxii. 14. (*Emphatic Diaglott.*) We expect to find that the elect, the true election of grace, will not be such as the systems of men have taught, an election out of the *lost*; but rather an election out of the *saved*, a little flock to whom a kingdom is promised, those who strive to enter in at the strait gate and are

Digitized by Google

found walking the narrow way of self-denial, concerning which it is said, "*few* there be that find it." Here too shall we find a fuller meaning and true significance given to that passage so rarely appreciated and never understood by the ultra-Calvinist. (2 Pet. i. 10, 11.) "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" and that in Rev. xix. 7, 8, 9, "Let us be glad and rejoice and give honour to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb." Let any who have thought that the word "called" in this last verse, and the same word in Matt. xxii. 14 has the same import,—so much and no more,—think yet again before they are quite sure that they have the mind of Christ.

Before proceeding further with my subject, I wish to make a quotation from a sermon preached by Bishop Latimer about 1550, upon the words, "Thy kingdom come;" more especially as it supports the theory already advanced, and serves to show the thought entertained by him more than three hundred years ago. "Antichrist is already known throughout all the world. Wherefore the day is not far off. Let us beware, for it will one day fall on our heads. 'The end of all things draweth near.' St. Peter said so at his time. How much more shall we say so? The world was ordained to endure (as all learned men affirm, and prove it from Scripture) six thousand years. Now, of that number there be past 5552 years, so there is no more left but 448 years. And furthermore those days shall be shortened, it shall not be full six thousand years, the days shall be shortened for the elect's sake. Therefore all those excellent and learned men which without doubt God hath sent into the world in these days to give the world warning, all those men do gather out of the Scriptures that the last day cannot be far off. Peradventure it may come in my days, old as I am, or in our children's days. There will be great alterations in that day, there will be hurly-burly, like as when a man dieth. There will be alteration in the earth and elements, as if to lose their former nature and become endued with another. 'And then shall they see the Son of Man come in a cloud with power and great glory.'"

Now *we* are not looking for the last day, or the end of the world. These we know to be in the far distance beyond millennial glory. But we *are* "looking for that blessed hope, the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

(To be continued.)

Digitized by Google

THY KINGDOM COME.

THY kingdom come.
I heard a seer cry: "The wilderness,
The solitary place,
Shall yet be glad for him, and he shall bless
(Thy kingdom come) with his revealed face
The forests; they shall drop their precious gum,
And shed for him their balm: and he shall yield
The grandeur of his speech to charm the field.

"Then all the soothed winds shall drop to listen,
(Thy kingdom come,)
Comforted waters waxen calm shall glisten
With bashful tremblement beneath his smile:
And echo ever the while
Shall take, and in her awful joy repeat,
The laughter of his lips—(Thy kingdom come):
And hills that sit apart shall be no longer dumb,
No, they shall shout and shout,
Raining their lovely royalty along the dewy plain:
And valleys round about.

"And all the well contented land, made sweet
With flowers she opened at his feet,
Shall answer: shout and make the welkin ring,
And tell it to the stars, shout, shout, and sing;
Her cup being full to the brim,
Her poverty made rich with him,
Her yearning satisfied to its utmost sum—
Lift up thy voice, O earth, prepare thy song,
It shall not yet be long,
Lift up, O earth, for he shall come again,
Thy Lord; and he shall reign, and he SHALL reign—
Thy kingdom come." JEAN INGELOW.

THE TWO ADAMS.

I *THE human world in its present natural state, as descended from Adam, is sundered from its proper life in God by sin, and utterly disabled in this character for rising by itself to any higher position.* The fall of Adam was the fall of the race. Not simply because he represented the race, but because the race was itself comprehended in his person. The terrible fact of sin revealed itself in him as a world-fact, that was now incorporated with the inmost life of humanity itself, and became from this point onward an insurmountable law in the progress of its development.

Digitized by Google

The ruin under which we lie is an organic ruin; the ruin of our nature; universal and whole, not simply because all men are sinners, but as making all men sinners. Men do not make their nature, their nature makes them. To have part in human nature at all, we must have part in it primarily as a fallen nature; a spiritually impotent nature; from whose constitution the principle of life has departed in its very root. Not by accident or bad example only, as the Pelagians vainly dream, are we all in the same condemnation. There is a law of sin at work in us from our birth. The whole Pelagian view of life is shallow in the extreme. It sees in the human race only a vast aggregation of particular men outwardly put together; a huge living sand-heap, and nothing more. But the human race is not a sand-heap. It is the power of a single life. It is bound together, not outwardly, but inwardly. Men have been one before they became many; and as many, they are still one. We have a perfect right then to say that Adam's sin is imputed to all his posterity. Only let us not think of a mere outward transfer in the case. Against *such* imputation the objection commonly made to the doctrine has force. It would be to substitute a fiction for a fact. No imputation of that sort is taught in the Bible. But the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity involves no fiction. It is counted to them simply because it is theirs in fact. They are born into Adam's nature, and for this reason only, as forming with him the same general life, they are born also into his guilt.

2. *The union in which we stand with our first parent, as thus fallen, extends to his entire person,* BODY *as well as* SOUL. He did not fall in his soul simply, nor in his body simply, but in both at once. The *man* fell; so the humanity of which he was the root, fell in him and with him, to the same extent. The *whole* became corrupt. And now as such it includes in all his posterity, a real and true perpetuation of his life under both forms on to the end of time. They partake of his body as well as of his soul. Both are transmitted by ordinary generation, the same identical organic life-stream, from one age onward always to another. We are bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, and blood of his blood. And still there is no material communication, no local contact. Not a particle of Adam's body has come into ours. The identity resolves itself at last into an invisible law; and it is not one law for the body, and another law for the soul; but one and the same law involves the presence of both, as the power of a common life. Where the law works, there Adam's life is reproduced, body and soul together. And still the individual Adam is not blended with his posterity in any such way as to lose his own personality or swallow up theirs. His identity with his posterity is generic; but none the less real or close on this account. We are all familiar with the case, and if we stop to think of it at all can hardly feel perhaps that it calls for any explanation. And yet of a truth, it is something very wonder-

Digitized by Google

ful. A mystery in fact, that goes quite beyond the region of the understanding.

3. *By the hypostatical union of the two natures in the person of* JESUS CHRIST, *our humanity as fallen in Adam was exalted again to a new and imperishable divine life.* That the race might be saved, it was necessary that a work should be wrought not beyond it, but in it; and this inward salvation to be effective, must lay hold of the race itself in its organic, universal character, before it could extend to individuals, since in no other way was it possible for it to cover fully the breadth and depth of the ruin that lay in its way. Such an inward salvation of the race required that it should be joined in a living way with the divine nature itself, as represented by the everlasting Word or *Logos*, the fountain of all created light and life. The Word accordingly became flesh, that is assumed humanity into union with itself. It was not an act, whose force was intended to stop in the person of one man himself to be transplanted soon afterwards to heaven. Nor was it intended merely to serve as the necessary basis of the great work of atonement, the power of which might be applied to the world subsequently in the way of outward imputation. It had this use indeed, but not as its first and most comprehensive necessity. The object of the incarnation was to couple the human nature in real union with the Logos, as the permanent source of life. It resulted from the presence of sin only, (itself no part of this nature in its original constitution,) that the union thus formed called the Saviour to suffer. As the bearer of a fallen humanity, he must descend with it to the lowest depths of sorrow and pain, in order that he might triumph with it again in the power of his own imperishable life. In all this he acted for himself, and yet for the race he represented at the same time. For it was no external relation simply, that he sustained to this last. He was Himself the race. Humanity dwelt in his person as the second Adam, under a higher form than ever it carried in the first.

4. *The value of Christ's sufferings and death, as well as of his entire life, in relation to men, springs wholly from the view of the incarnation now presented.* The assumption of humanity on the part of the *Logos* involved the necessity of suffering, as the only way in which the new life with which it was joined could triumph over the law of sin and death it was called to surmount. The passion of the Son of God was the world's *crisis*, in which the principle of health came to its last struggle with the principle of disease, and burst forth from the very bosom of the grave itself in the form of immortality. This was the atonement; Christ's victory over sin and hell. As such, it forms the only medium of salvation to men. But how? Only as the value of it is made over in each case to the subject, who is to be saved. This we are told is by imputation. But does the act of imputation reckon to us as ours that which is not ours in fact? Does it proceed upon

Digitized by Google

a fiction of the divine mind? Just as little as in the case of our relation to the sin of Adam. This last is not a foreign evil arbitrarily set over to our account. It is immanent to our nature itself. Just so here. The atonement as a foreign work, could not be made to reach us in the way of a true salvation. Only as it may be considered *immanent* in our nature itself, can it be imputed to us as ours, and so become available in us for its own ends. And this is its character in truth. It holds in humanity, as a work wrought out by it in Christ. When Christ died and rose, humanity died and rose at the same time in His person; not figuratively, but truly; just as it had fallen before in the person of Adam.

5. *The Christian salvation then, as thus comprehended in Christ, is a new* LIFE, *in the deepest sense of the word.* Not a doctrine merely for the mind to embrace; not an event simply to be remembered with faith, as the basis of piety in the way of example or other outward support; the sense of some, who have much to say of Christianity as a fact in their own shallow way. Not the constitution only of a new order of spiritual relations, or a new system of divine appliances, in the case of fallen, helpless man. But a new *Life* introduced into the very centre of humanity itself. In this view, though bound most closely with the organic development of the world's history as it stood before, it is by no means comprehended in it, or carried by it, as its proper product and fruit. Christianity is more than a continuation simply of Judaism. It claims the character of a *creation*, by which old things in the end must pass away, and all things become new. This indicates, however, its relation to the old order. That is not to be annihilated by it, but taken up into it as a higher life. The incarnation is supernatural; not magical, however; not fantastic or visionary; not something to be gazed at as a transient prodigy in the world's history. It is the supernatural linking itself to the onward flow of the world's life, and becoming thenceforward itself the ground and principle of the entire organism, now poised at last on its true centre. In this sense, Christianity is indeed a *fact;* even as the first creation was a fact; a fact for all time; a WORLD-FACT.

6. *The new Life of which Christ is the source and Organic Principle, is in all respects a true* HUMAN *life.* It is in one sense a Divine life. It springs from the *Logos*. It is not the life of the Logos separately taken; it is the life of the Word made flesh, the Divinity joined in personal union with our humanity. It is not in the way of show merely that Christ put on our nature; as many of the old Gnostics believed, and as the view that multitudes still have of the Christian salvation would seem to imply. He put it on truly, and in the fullest sense. He was man more perfectly than this could be said of Adam himself, even before he fell; humanity stood revealed in his person under its most perfect form. Not a new humanity wholly dissevered from that of Adam; but the humanity of Adam itself, only raised to a higher character,

Digitized by Google

and filled with new meaning and power, by its union with the divine nature. The new creation in Christ Jesus appeared originally only in this form, and can hold in no other to the end of time.

7. *Christ's life, as now described, rests not in His separate person, but passes over to His people; thus constituting the* CHURCH, *which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.* This is involved in the view already taken of His person, as the principle of the new creation. The process by which the whole is accomplished is not mechanical but organic. It takes place in the way of history, growth, regular living development. Christ goes not forth to heal the the world by outward power, as standing beyond himself; he gathers it rather into His own person, that is, stretches over it the law of His own life, so that it is made at last to hold in Him and from Him altogether, as its root. As individuals, we are inserted into Him by our regeneration, which is thus the true counterpart of the first birth that makes us natural men. We are not however set over into this new order of existence wholly at once. This would be magic. We are apprehended by it, in the first place, only as it were at a single point. But this point is central. The new life lodges itself, as an efflux from Christ, in the inmost core of our personality. Here it becomes the principle or seed of our sanctification; which is simply the gradual transfusion of the same exalted spiritual quality or potence though our whole persons. The process terminates with the resurrection. All analogies borrowed from a lower sphere to illustrate this great mystery, are necessarily poor, and always more or less perilous. Perhaps the best is furnished by the action of a magnet on iron. The man in his natural state centres upon himself, and is thus spiritually dead. In his regeneration, he is touched with a divine attraction that draws him to Christ, the true centre of life. The tendency and motion here come not of himself, grow not out of what he was before. They are in obedience simply to the magnetic stream that has reached him from without. The old nature still continues to work. The iron is not at once made free from its *gravity*. But a new law is producing at every point, an inward nisus in the opposite direction; which needs only to be filled with new force continually from the magnetic centre to carry all at last its own way. "I, if I be lifted up," says Christ, "will draw all men unto Me!"

8. *As joined to Christ, then, we are* ONE *with him in his life, and not simply in the way of a less intimate and real union.* The new birth involves a substantial change in the centre of our being. It is not the understanding or the will simply, that is wrought upon in a natural or supernatural way. Not this or that power or function of the man is it, that may be called the seat of what is thus introduced into his person. Life is not thinking, nor feeling, nor acting; but the organic unity of all these, inseparably joined together. In this sense, we say of our union with Christ, that it is a

Digitized by Google

new *life*. It is deeper than all thought, feeling, or exercise of will. Not a quality only. Not a mere relation. A relation in fact, as that of iron to the magnet; but one that carries into the centre of the subject a form of being which was not there before. Christ communicates His own life substantially to the soul on which He acts, causing it to grow into His very nature. This is the *mystical union;* the basis of our whole salvation; the only medium by which it is possible for us to have an interest in the grace of Christ under any other view.

9. *Our relation with Christ is not simply parallel with our relation to Adam, but goes* BEYOND IT, *as being immeasurably more intimate and deep.* Adam was the first man; Christ is the archetypal man, in whom the true ideal of humanity has been brought into view. Adam stands related to the race as a simple generic head; Christ as the true centre and universal basis of humanity itself. Our nature took its start in Adam; it finds its end and last ground only in Christ. It comes not with us to the exercise of a free, full personality, till we are consciously joined to the person of the divine *Logos* in our nature. In a deep sense thus, Christ is the universal man. His *Person* is the root, in the presence and power of which only all other personalities can stand, in the case of his people, whether in time, or eternity. They not only spring from him, as we all do from Adam, but continue to stand in him, as an all present, everywhere active personal Life. In this way, they all have part in his Divinity itself; though the hypostatical union as such, remains limited of course, to his own person.* The whole Christ lives and works in the Church, super-

---

* Personality is constituted by self-consciousness. This includes, in our natural state, no reference whatever to an original progenitor. Adam forms in no sense the centre of our life, the basis of our spiritual being. But the *Christian* consciousness carries in its very nature, such a reference to the person of Jesus Christ. It consists in the active sense of this relation, as the true and proper life of its subject. The man does not connect with Christ the self-consciousness, which He has under a different form, in the way of outward reference merely; but this reference is comprehended in His self-consciousness itself, so far as He has become spiritually renewed. Christ is felt to be the centre of His life; or rather this feeling may be said to be itself His life, the form in which He exists as a self-conscious person. It is with reason, therefore, that *Schleiermacher* speaks of the communication which Christ makes of Himself to believers, as moulding the *person;* since He imparts, in fact, a new higher consciousness, that forms the basis of a life that was not previously at hand, the true centre of our personality under its most perfect form. In this case, the person of Christ is the ground and fountain of all proper Christian personality in the church. It is only as He is consciously in communion with Christ as his life centre, (which can only be through an actual self-communication—*Wesensmittheilung*—of Christ's life to him for this purpose,) that the believer can be regarded as a *Christian*, or a new man in Christ Jesus. So *Olshausen:* "The personality of the Son Himself, as the comprehensive element, takes all the personalities of His people into itself, and then again penetrates them with His life, like the

Digitized by Google

naturally, gloriously, mysteriously, and yet really and truly, "always, to the end of the world." Glory be to God!

10. *This union of Christ with believers, is wrought by the power of the* HOLY GHOST. The new life is from the Spirit. It is by the Spirit the divine life is sustained and advanced in us, at every point from its commencement to its close. There is no other medium, by which it is possible for us to be in Christ, or to have Christ in ourselves. The new creation holds absolutely and entirely in the powerful presence of the Holy Ghost. Hence it is said, "He that is joined to the Lord, is one *spirit*;" and the indwelling of Christ and his Spirit in believers, is spoken of as the same thing. But for this very reason, we have no right to dissolve this unity again in our thoughts, by making the presence of the Spirit a mere substitute for the presence of Christ himself. Where the one is, there the other is truly and really at the same time. The Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son and subsisting in everlasting union with both, constitutes the form, in which and by which the new creation in Christ Jesus upholds itself, and reveals itself in all its extent. It is not *Nature* but *Spirit*. So is the Person of Christ himself, the root of this creation. The Spirit was never brought near to men before, as now through the incarnate Word. It dwelt in him without measure. Humanity itself was filled completely with its presence, and appears at last translucent with the glory of heaven itself by its means. Forth from the person of Christ, thus "quickened in the spirit," the flood of life pours itself onward continually in the Church, only of course by the presence and power of the Holy Ghost; for it holds in no other form. Not however by the power of the Holy Ghost, as abstracted from the presence of Christ himself; as though he were the fountain only, and not the very life-stream too, of the new creation, or could be supposed to be in it and with it by the intervention only of a presence, not involving at the same time and to the same extent his own. "The Lord is that Spirit." He reveals himself in his people, dwells in them, and makes them one with himself in a real way, by his spirit. In this view, the new life formed in them is *spiritual;* not natural or physical, as belonging to the first creation. But this does not imply at all, that it is limited to the soul as distinguished from the body. There is no absolute opposition here between the idea of body and the idea of spirit. There is a spiritual *body*, as well as a body natural, according to the apostle. The Spirit of Christ, in his own person at least, fills the whole man, soul and body. All is spiritual, glorious, heavenly. His whole humanity has been taken up into the sphere of the spirit, and appears transfigured into the same life. And why then should it not extend itself, in the way of strict organic continuity, as a

---

living centre, so to speak, of an organism from which life streams out, and to which it returns. (John xiv. 20.)

Digitized by Google

whole humanity also, by the active presence of Christ's spirit, over into the persons of his people? A spiritual life no more excludes the thought of the body in the one case, than it does in the other.

11. *Christ's life is apprehended on the part of his people only by* FAITH. The life itself comes to us wholly from Christ himself, by the power of his Spirit. The magnetic stream is poured upon us from above. If we move at all, it is only in obedience to the Divine current thus brought to bear upon our souls. To live in this at all, however, it is necessary that we should surrender ourselves spontaneously to its power. This is faith; the most comprehensive, fundamental act, of which our nature is capable. The man swings himself, in the totality of his being, quite off from the centre of self, on which hitherto his consciousness has been poised, over upon Christ, now revealed to his view, as another centre altogether. The birth of a new *life*, in the strictest sense, as we have already seen. Faith, of course, is not the principle of this life. It is only the medium of its introduction into the soul, and the condition of its growth and development when present. But as such it is indispensable. The process of our sanctification is spiritual, and not mechanical or magical.*

12. *The new life of the believer includes degrees, and will become complete only in the* RESURRECTION. Only in this form could it have a true human character. All life, in the case of man, is actualised, and can be actualised, only in the way of process or gradual historical development. So in the case before us, there is the seed; and when it springs, "first the blade, then the ear, and after that, the full corn in the ear." The new life struggles with the old, like Jacob and Esau in the same womb! The Christian carries in himself two forms of existence, a "law of sin and death" on the one hand, and "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," on the other; and the power of the last is continually opposed and restrained by the power of the first. From its very start, however, the life of Christ in the believer is a whole life; and in all its subsequent progress it reveals its power continually, under the same character. From the first it includes in itself *potentially* all that it is found to become at the last. The life of the tree is only the same life that was comprehended originally in the seed from which it has sprung. So it is with all life. All that belongs, then, to the new life of the Christian, conceived as complete at the last day, must be allowed to be involved in it as principle and process from the beginning. In every stage of its progress, it is a true human life, answering to the nature of its organic root, and to the nature also of the subject in which it is lodged. It is always, as far as it prevails, the law of a new nature for the body as well as for the soul. The full and final triumph of the process, is the resur-

* "Living faith in Christ," says Schleiermacher, "is nothing but the self-consciousness of our union with Christ."

Digitized by Google

rection, which is reached in the case of the individual, only in connection with the consumation of the Church as the whole. The bodies of the saints in glory will be only the last result, in organic continuity, of the divine life of Christ, implanted in their souls at their regeneration. There is nothing abrupt in Christianity. It is a supernatural constitution indeed; but as such it is clothed in a natural form, and involves in itself as regular a law of historical development, as the old creation itself. The resurrection body will be simply the ultimate outburst of the life, that has been ripening for immortality under cover of the old Adamic nature before. The winged Psyche has its elemental organisation in the worm, and does not lose it in the tomb-like chrysalis. Let us not be told, that this is to suppose two bodies in the person of the believer at one time. Does the new life, abstracted from the body, involve the supposition of two *souls?* The cases are precisely parallel. The man is one, soul and body. But the new organic law has become lodged in the inmost centre of his personality, and is now gradually extending its force over the entire constitution of his nature as a whole. It does not lay hold of one part of his being first, and then proceed to another, in the way of outward territorial conquest; as though a hand or foot could be renovated before the head, or the understanding apart from the will, or the soul in no connection with the body. The whole man is made the subject of the new life at once. The law of revolution involved in it extends from the centre to the extreme periphery of his person. The old body becomes itself, in a mysterious way, the womb of a higher corporeity, the life-law of Christ's own glorious body; which is at last, through the process of death and the resurrection, set free from the first form of existence entirely, and made to supersde it for ever in the immortality of heaven.

* J. W. NEVIN, D.D.

CHERUBIC PHENOMENA.

BY WILLIAM MORRIS, M.D.

THIRD SECTION.

The Cherubim in the Visions seen by Ezekiel.

SOLOMON the king assembled the elders of Israel to bring up "the ark of the covenant of the LORD" from Mount Zion to Mount Moriah. And in the midst of a stately procession it was borne by the Levites, and carried into the most holy place of the temple which Solomon had built.

That most holy place abounded with cherubic designs. Embroidered and embossed in blue, and purple, and crimson, and fine linen, they formed the substance of "the vail" separating the holy place from the most holy, and were carved in relief on the olive-wood walls; which

Digitized by Google

were completely covered with gold. And besides these, there were two colossal cherubim of statuary work, artistically covered with gold, and standing on their feet, one on each side of the most holy; their extended wings meeting in the space above, and shadowing the mercy-seat.

As these magnificent cherubim stood, one on each side of the ark, they seem to have symbolised the idea that the executive powers of the divine government over Israel stood ready to take up and bear away the cheh-cheinal glory of the Divine presence, whenever the regal relations of Jehovah towards that nation should be suspended: and within the period of Ezekiel's prophetic course, those relations were suspended.

Ephraim, or the ten tribes, had long been in captivity. Judah had been carried captive to Babylon. Jerusalem and the temple had been burned and destroyed; but previous to that destruction, the glory of the LORD had departed from between the cherubim, and that departure was symbolised in the visions which Ezekiel beheld.

In those visions the cherubic phenomena are graphically described. In the first the prophet beheld a whirlwind, a great cloud; and in the cloud a fire involving and convolving its flame with a self-rotary motion, and having a photosphere of amber-coloured brightness. From within this sublime scene, preternatural forms, four in number, came forth, having the appearance of living creatures, and a certain human resemblance. Each had four faces and four wings. Their feet were like those of a young beeve, and glittered with a brightness as of burnished copper. The likeness of hands was under their wings. The faces of each were like those of a man, and a lion, and an eagle, and an ox. Their movements were in a direct line. They glowed as with the brightness of fire. An appearance as of torches moved up and down among them: and themselves appeared as in an atmosphere of fire, from the midst of which lightnings gleamed. "They ran and returned like a flash of lightning."

Associated with these cherubic appearances were complex and mighty wheels, golden-hued and brilliant, as if formed of polished chrysolite; and their felloes "were so high that they were dreadful; and they were full of eyes." The entire assemblage and combination symbolised a new evolution in the Divine government over Israel.

In the same vision the prophet beheld a "firmament"—that is, a solid expanse—over the heads of the cherubim; the appearance of which was "as the colour of the terrible crystal."* Above and upon that

* "The terrible crystal," to which the prophet compares the expanse which he beheld, and which is called the "firmament," is an astronomic *reality*, mentioned in the Mosaic record of the creation. As it is written: "And God said, Let there be an expanse in the midst of the fluids, and let it divide between fluids, and fluids. And God made the expanse, and divided between the fluids which were beneath the expanse, and the fluids which were above the expanse: and it was so expanded—*tah-rah-kee-ang'*. And God called the expanse heavens." The original of this last word is *shah-mah'-yim*; a dual phrase, meaning *the fluids* THERE, in contradistinction from the fluids *here* on the earth.

The English word "firmament," being supposed to be derived from the Ptolemaic theory of "crystal spheres," and that theory having been exploded, it is taken for granted that this part of the Mosaic record relates simply to the atmosphere, as bearing up the clouds. But the atmosphere is not an expanse in the true meaning of the Hebrew term; neither was it "made," in the sense of being formed or fashioned, in accordance with a definite design; nor does it bear any

Digitized by Google

expanse was the likeness of a throne, as of the appearance of sapphire—deep blue interspersed with gold-like spangles: and upon the throne was the likeness of A MAN, seated in a sphere of amber-coloured flame; himself seeming to be entirely vested with radiant fire. The arched ornament above the throne was like the rainbow, when its hues are most perfectly displayed. And seeing all these marvels, the prophet understood that "this was the appearance of the glory of the LORD."

In subsequent visions Ezekiel saw the glory of the LORD come forth from within the temple in Jerusalem, upborne by a cherub, and pass out to the threshold. Then it was raised above the threshold; and departed from above the threshold and stood over the cherubim. The cherubim expanded their wings and mounted up from the earth accompanied by the wondrous wheels. The glory of the LORD was above them, and thus departed from the city, and stood upon the Mount of Olives.

The regal relations of the Divine King of Israel were suspended. Over that nation the LORD had said, "LO-AMMI:" and the principles of this Divine procedure are revealed.

a. About nine centuries previous to these visions Israel had broken the national covenant into which they entered at Sinai, and had thereby forfeited all blessing; for by disobedience they had forfeited all right to national life. And although reprieved and continued in the land, they were not, neither could they be, released from their legal and covenant engagements. For it is an axiom, even in human jurisprudence, that moral and legal obligation cannot be annulled, or at all diminished, by the disobedience of the subject.

b. Through the ministry of the prophets the LORD held the nation to their covenant engagements and responsibilities. He could not permit

---

resemblance to a solid and mechanically formed expanse, which is the meaning of *rah-kee-ang'*, translated "firmament," and means a solid crystal expanse. That is, an expanded annulus, pertaining to this planet, and accompanying its movements in a manner somewhat similar to the "rings of Saturn." And to this annulus, Ezekiel alludes, calling it "the awe-inspiring crystal." Isaiah alludes to the same, and calls it "the circle of the earth;" while, as in a vision, he beholds the LORD throned thereon, looking down on the earth, "and the inhabitants thereof are as grass-hoppers" in his sight. And in the psalms also, "the fluids which are above the heavens" are mentioned; that is, the fluids borne up by the expanse which God called *sha mah'-yim;* the term *mah'-yim*, meaning "waters" in ordinary speech; but ideally, and in the cosmogony of Moses, the term means fluids, without determining their qualities.

The *actual* discoveries of science are, of necessity, in accordance with divine revelation. And while inspired truth needs no confirmation from scientific discoveries, such may serve to illustrate some of the physical works of God: and that part of the Mosaic record now reviewed is in this manner illustrated, to our advantage.

As the result of a series of astronomical observations and mathematical calculations, it is concluded that the "rings of Saturn" sustain a mass of *fluids*, the particles of which are free to move among themselves; and, thus, secure the stability of those annuli. By a continuous course of observation, and by reasoning on the data obtained, it has been inferred that the earth is encompassed by an annulus, which is the most probable occasion of the zodiacal light. Humboldt has published his discovery of an annulus "between the orbits of Venus and Mars;" and therefore, in the centre of that annulus is the earth. And by that discovery the Mosaic record is illustrated.

Digitized by Google

them even to think that their disobedience could be any reason why their obligations to obey should be in any degree relaxed.

c. But, through his prophets, the LORD sent to them repeated proclamations of *amnesty;* such, for example, as this:—

"Wash you, make you clean; take away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes: cease from doing evil, learn to do well; seek out justice; succour the oppressed; do justice to the fatherless, right the widow. Come, now, let us reason together, saith Jehovah; though your sins be as scarlet, I will make them white as snow; and though they be red as crimson, I will whiten them as wool. If you be willing and obey me, ye shall eat the good of the land: but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword, for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it."

d. But corrective judgments, and proclamations of amnesty, and moral suasion, were alike disregarded; and the just consequence was that the nation was forsaken of God. The glory of the LORD departed from the temple and city.

A remnant of Judah returned from Babylon, according to the word of the LORD. The temple was rebuilt; but the glory of the LORD did not return,—did not come and take possession of that temple, More than two thousand years have passed since that glory departed. Will it never return? Human reason and unbelief say, "*Never.*" Gentile traditionary teaching asserts that "all the glory ever promised to Jerusalem and Israel, came to the city and temple nineteen centuries past:" and in support of this, a mistranslation of a clause in a glorious promise, is alleged; and that promise is said to have been fulfilled.

When Judah had returned from the Babylonian captivity, and while the temple was being restored, Haggai prophesied of goodness and glory that should yet be seen in Israel. But by the mistranslation of a certain clause that prophecy is obscured and perverted; that clause being rendered thus, "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the former." Whereas, the true reading is, "the latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former." The received English version of the clause is both critically and historically incorrect; and thereby the scope of the prophecy is misconstrued, and the whole is strangely misapplied to the temple which was then being built; notwithstanding that the phrase, "this house," is manifestly idiomatic, the prophet having previously used it as including the temple built by Solomon:—"Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison with it as nothing?"

Nevertheless, by that imaginary method which is called "spiritualising the Scriptures," the promissory prediction is said to have been fulfilled by the appearance of the Lord Christ in Jerusalem, and at the temple. But thereby the great mystery of the incarnation is ignored, and an utter forgetfulness is shown concerning the truth that the Son of God came in humiliation; having become *a man*, a Jew, a member of the nation, and of the tribe of Judah; and, *as such*, having no legal right to pass beyond the court of the temple, pertaining to the common people.

Now let the prophecy be read.—"Thus saith the LORD of hosts, yet once, a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all the nations, and the Desire of

Digitized by Google

all the nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the LORD of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the LORD of hosts. The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former, saith the LORD of hosts: and in this place will I give peace, saith the LORD of hosts."

This promissory prediction is referred to in the epistle to the Hebrews. In the first place, the inspired writer alludes to the earthquake, when "the law" was enacted; saying of the LORD, "whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also the heaven."

The voice of the LORD shook the earth when he came down in his glory, with ten thousands of his holy ones* on Mount Sinai. And the voice of the same LORD will shake the earth and the heavens, when he shall come down in his glory, with the holy angels, on the Mount of Olives. And from that day the promissory prediction, through the prophet Haggai, will begin to be fulfilled.

We return to the visions which Ezekiel beheld.† Towards the end of his course, and fourteen years after Jerusalem had been smitten and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, the prophet was carried "in the visions of God" into the land of Israel, and set upon a very high mountain. Thence he beheld the architectural scheme of a city, and in that city a temple of surpassing grandeur, and different in many important respects from any temple that has yet been erected in Jerusalem. Every part of that temple was particularly shewn by the LORD to his prophet. And, in the sequel of the vision, "the glory of the God of Israel," with the attendant che-

---

* The holy angels are executive sub-agents in the physical, and moral, and providential departments of the divine government over this world. They are especially occupied on behalf of the saints and children of God, in what relates to their temporal welfare; and their sub-agency in the universal economy of God furnishes an additional illustration of the symbolic intent and significance of the cherubim.

† It will, doubtless, have been observed in reading the record of the first vision, that Ezekiel does not call the "likeness of the living creatures" the cherubim; but in recording the next and subsequent visions of the same character, he thus names them, and says, "I knew them to be the cherubim." He recognised them through an historic and traditionary knowledge of the Edenic cherubim and their artistic resemblance, which was an integral portion of the mercy-seat. And indeed, a traditionary knowledge of the Edenic cherubim was possessed by other ancient and oriental peoples and nations, and is embodied in sculptured forms found among the ruins and remains of ancient cities,—Thebes and Nineveh, for instance,—and shown in their relative positions as the symbolic guards of the palaces of despotic kings, and the temples of imaginary gods. And that traditionary and perverted knowledge engaged also the art of the painter is shown by corresponding and composite representations, portrayed on the entablatures of such palaces and temples. And, besides this, a history might be written of the perversion of the original knowledge of the Edenic facts and phenomena, and the various uses to which it has been employed; for in that way originated the astronomical signs of the zodiac and the constellations, the heraldic cognisances of potentates, princes, and nobles, and also the artistic and representative forms of idolatrous regard. Sinful man worships that of which he is afraid, rather than that which he loves. The first man was afraid of the phenomena at the tree of life, and hence the idolatrous use made of a traditionary knowledge of the cherubim; and, as an effect of the delusive words, "Ye shall be as gods," the chiefs and potentates of antiquity dignified their palaces with attempted imitations of cherubic designs.

Digitized by Google

rubim, came again into view, even the same marvellous appearances which the prophet had seen in the land of the Chaldeans. In this vision the glory of the LORD appeared over the Mount of Olives, whence it came to the city, and entered into the temple. "And behold, the glory of the LORD filled the temple." Thus Ezekiel beheld, *in vision*, the fulfilment of the promise made through Haggai concerning "the latter glory of this house," and that vision was given as a divine pledge of the actual fulfilment of the exceeding great and precious promises which the LORD had made concerning the whole house of Israel.

To engage in any kind of argument to *prove* the glorious future of Israel and Jerusalem, in presence of that crowning vision, would be an act of officious impertinence. Our proper service is to present the testimony of God concerning that nation and city.

"Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the (whole) house of Israel: After these days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "Israel shall be saved in the LORD, with an everlasting salvation." "Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her captivity with justice." "The ransomed of the LORD shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." "For Zion's sake I will not be silent, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a brilliant lamp. And the nations shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory." "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the LORD is risen upon thee." "The nations shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy sun-rising." "The sons of them that afflicted thee shall come bending to thee; and they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The City of Jehovah, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel." "In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the LORD thy Redeemer. For this is as the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the LORD, who hath mercy on thee."

(*To be continued.*)

Digitized by Google

FRAGMENTS.

I.

WITH God "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Some regard this as an intimation that with God there is no such thing as Time: that with him past and present are meaningless terms, for all is one "Eternal *Now*" in his sight. I lately read somewhere, that the judgment day is no event of the future with God, for it is actually spread out before him in present vision, and the doom of the impenitent already pronounced. Whatever meaning this idea may represent to some minds, to me it is utter confusion, and seems like attempting to concentrate infinite eternity into one finite point of time; and then, to get quit of the difficulty of such a finiteness, styling it an "eternal now;" in other words, an infinite finiteness, which is a contradiction in terms. This would also make *man* eternal, for in God's sight he *was*,—that is, he existed,—before the actual creation. A profound and pious Scottish metaphysician and divinity professor, confessed to a feeling of sacred awe which possessed him when first he met with this idea; and stated with what horror, and almost loathing, he regarded a youth who treated it with flippancy. The professor must have seen more of *mystery*, and the youth more of *mystification*, than meaning in it; and each conception produced its own appropriate effect. The whole view of the case seems a confounding of cause with effect; or the co-existence of events with God's foreknowledge; thereby making the actual to pre-exist, not in the ideal but in the real—an impossibility. The Scripture quoted will answer well enough, I think, if understood as implying that the Divine Being is not affected by days or centuries in his mighty workings, nor does time weaken or impair his memory, if we may so express it, as with man.

II.

I have heard it asserted from the pulpit with reference to religious beliefs, that creeds determine deeds; in other words, that our life is necessarily as our doctrine, the latter being but root to the former. And not only so, but that apart from sound doctrine there is no sound life to correspond. Now, granting that it be in a general way true, that we do go in the direction of our beliefs—be they true or false—is this invariably the case? Do we not frequently, in matters of supremest interest, act quite contrary to our belief? and how often, alas, not up to our belief! Does not this prove the existence of some mighty force anterior and superior to our belief, at work within us, at times over-riding and mastering it, and so leading us captive? Faith may sometimes feed this life, but the life itself is "more than meat," and will assert its independence and power; and, when directed aright, will reveal itself in grand impulses and true actions and divine longings. The Master recognised this power within us,—call it instinct, intuition, the logic of the heart, or what you will,—I think, when he said: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." This secret yet strong persuasion of the heart cometh not from doctrine but from duty. Good deeds are good creeds.

Digitized by Google

III.

God's revelation *to* the man—whether from Nature or in the Bible—must have due regard to the revelation already *within* him; otherwise it forfeits its claim to acceptance. Therefore, whatever in the Bible apparently violates those first principles, or breaks the true harmony in the soul of man must be rejected as unworthy of God. For instance, were it stated as true that God is *hatred* and not love, it would be no truth to me, for he who made me has revealed a prior truth within my heart which contradicts that assertion and makes it impossible for me to believe a lie. In order, therefore, to make it a true revelation to me, my moral sense would require reversing; in fact I must be unmade. But, it may be argued, the light that is in me has become darkness, or otherwise the outward revelation would be perceived. Supposing it were so—which I do not concede—I am not responsible for that, and it still holds true that the revelation is nothing more to me than light is to a blind man, and I must reject it as worthless.

IV.

May not "original depravity"—which by the bye is a contradiction in terms—be only another name for original ignorance, which, like darkness, is of a privative character? Adam, who began life—as is supposed—a man and not a babe, and consequently without the babe's ignorance,* was without this original depravity of nature. Nevertheless he sinned. Is not sin, then, the less sinful in those who begin life, unlike Adam, with this original depravity? Yet I have heard it stated that David's sin was the *less* to be palliated for that "in sin did his mother conceive him!"

V.

Why is a right faith the right thing—that in us which God requires? I suppose for two reasons chiefly, that it is *indicative* and *provocative*. It reveals a latent or revealed disposition of heart towards that which is right; and provokes to the doing of it. And more than that: in a right faith directed towards God as its object there is a tendency to assimilate the possessor of it to the nature of God. When faith is kindled the heart is reviving, and its true pulse beginning to beat. Till then, "many mighty works cannot be done," for their meaning would be misunderstood or perverted. "The light that is in thee is darkness."

VI.

Spiritual instincts or natural perceptions of truth, which come through a pre-established harmony with or submission to the will of God, are less fallible than human teaching from the written word; for the latter is dependent upon the weakness of human intellect and reason, but the former upon the direct action of great spiritual forces, producing as it were a kind of spiritual gravitation to truth. I suspect, however, that the written word is capable of being, in part at least, absorbed into the spiritual instincts and thus becoming assimilated to them. It is important, then, that we allow our moral instincts full play, and send them out into the highways of truth, that we may be strengthened in the

* Ah! and we may add—without the babe's inheritance. W. M.

Digitized by Google

inner man, and be the better qualified "to approve the things that are excellent."

VII.

Religious truth, like all truth, is *spherical* not *cubical*, for there are no sharp points and angles in it. It is capable, therefore, of being viewed from many stand-points, each of which brings before us some particular part, and each part as it were runs into another, so that we see not where it begins nor where it ends,—like the fleeting meteor in the infinite sphere of space. Happy they who seeing but a part mistake it not for the whole, but "walk in the light" which it sheds around them. But though there are no sharp points in the sphere, it does not follow that some parts are not more luminous than others; for as in the firmament of heaven, "one star differeth from another star in glory," and yet each is but a part of the infinite blue into which all are set; so is it in the realm of truth. And again, as the old and new worlds bring each its own constellations to view, so the new world will hereafter reveal new truths which in this world "eye hath not seen."

VIII.

Some good people seem to have formed a conception of God's character which, if it does not fully satisfy them, they are at least content to live by. To others the same estimate would be almost intolerable. In another sphere we have something analogous to this, where, what is food to one is poison to another.

* A Member of the Church of Scotland.

TEMPORAL DEATH NOT TOTAL EXTINCTION.

MR. MILL resumes discussion with a paper entitled: "Death the entire extinction of life." We admit it, and have never pleaded to the contrary. The life that it assails and vanquishes, it quenches, yea, *totally extinguishes*. Nevertheless it is restricted in its compass. And if it attacks a being of trifold life in the lowest range of that life, and so far overcomes, it does not at all follow that the entire extinction of that stage of life involves the destruction likewise of the higher and the highest life of this fearfully and wonderfully complex being—man. Nay, the Lord of life, the living Word of Truth, testifies expressly that he who can destroy the animal life of man, *cannot* destroy the soul-life. And the spirit-life of his renewed ones, no power ever can or shall destroy. This latter assured fact even Mr. Mill has not attempted to controvert.

It being conceded, then, that the spirit at least of the new-born man survives his physical death; the question at present in debate is, Whether his soul also survives in conjunction with his spirit, or whether it perishes in the body's death? It seems impossible to believe that the latter alternative is true, in view of our Lord's words—applying indifferently to human souls—that men *are not able* to kill the soul! If the souls of

Digitized by Google

men survive, therefore, they must survive in some condition, they must be in some intermediate state of living existence. Nor should the circumstance that the precise nature of the condition is as yet shrouded for us in impenetrable mystery, lead us to deny that there is such a condition. And let it not be said that this is a short and simple method of proof, and on that account is hardly satisfactory against such a profusion of able reasoning to the contrary. If it be indeed proof, grounded on the testimony of God, it ought to be conclusive for faith.

Now let us note some of the concessions made by our withstanding brethren. Mr. Mill expresses himself as "much pleased with the candid remarks of Mr. J. J. Hobbs in the March RAINBOW, headed, 'The Secondary Question.'" Some of these frank remarks "on the secondary question of the intermediate state," are:—"That there seem both Scripture and reason in the views so strongly insisted on by Mr. Hobson, none can fairly deny; but at the same time we must be careful not to mistake the survival of the soul or spirit and its continued individuality with the popular notions of its consciousness and capacity. Many Scriptures appear to teach that when the spirit returns to God, individuality is still retained (not so, we think, does Mr. Constable teach); and more than this, the spirit is identified with the man, and *in some secondary sense is regarded as the man.* How else are we to understand such well-known passages as, 'Absent from the body,' 'putting off this my tabernacle,' and the like? Let us willingly admit the force of these Scriptures, even though we be driven into difficulties. Common honesty in dealing with the Bible demands this. Nevertheless, spiritual survival and soul individualism, do not necessitate consciousness or capacity." These candid remarks are plainly in support of what I have been contending for as the true teaching of Scripture,—the survival of the individual soul and spirit of man over the death of his body of flesh, which hath its foundation in the dust, and which thither returns; and the identity of the spirit of man with the man, so that in some sense it is regarded as *the* man. Mr. Hobbs says that the spirit is regarded as the man *in some secondary sense.* And we quite admit that man, apart from body, is certainly not *perfect man.* But this holds equally true (and some of us think far more momentously true) of the body of man apart from spirit,—from fully developed life in spirit. And so it is that in this case too, the *imperfect man*, man who has not the spirit, is spoken of nevertheless as "man." In 1 Cor. iii. 4, St. Paul speaks of men, regarded as destitute of the spirit of God, very emphatically as (mere) "men;" for such should be the reading, instead of "carnal." Whilst confessing that there are great mysteries in regard of the intermediate state of man, which are not yet plainly revealed and which none have been able to fathom, we have yet ever read "the Bible through in the light of a belief" in the *actual* intermediate state of man, and could not understand its doctrine of the soul of man apart from this belief. Nor can we understand the language which speaks of an intermediate unclothed state for man within a period when the man, who is conceived of as in that state, is asserted to be absolutely non-existent. He is not, yet he is in intermediate condition, unclothed.

Our convictions, like Mr. Mill's, are Bible-derived; and we hold undoubtingly that "the general tenor of Divine teaching" is against him.

Digitized by Google

The mortality of the soul of man as necessarily coincident with that of his body, we have not found to be taught anywhere in the Scripture. On the contrary, we read "that the wicked is *reserved* to the day of destruction. They shall be *brought forth* to the day of wrath." (Job xxi. 30.) For "the Lord knoweth how . . . to *reserve* the unrighteous *unto* the day of judgment to be punished" (2 Pet. ii. 9); as he is *reserving* likewise "the angels that sinned" to the same end. (Verse 4.) If the wicked are in *reserve* until they be brought forth to judgment, how are they, the intermediate while, *extinct?*

Mr. Mill critically observes upon the texts chosen to head my paper in March (p. 131) that they "have no bearing upon the subject" discussed. We used them as motto texts, and think them perfectly appropriate. Whilst believing that the immediate historical reference of the language of Scripture is by no means to be overlooked; we are convinced that that language for the most part has further a prophetic and much more important reference *for us*. Be it that Mr. Mill has correctly interpreted the text from Habakkuk (chap. i. 12) in its relation to the occasion that called it forth; it certainly does not follow that we, believers now, have no true interest in these striking words of inspiration—"We shall not die." Nay, "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have *hope*." And on these very words, therefore, together with others of like import, we ourselves build most precious *hope*. "We shall not die;" but shall suffer "judgment" and "correction," so as that (chap. ii. 4) "the just shall live by his faith;" and ultimately we may exclaim (chap. iii. 18, 19), "I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my *salvation*. The Lord God is my strength . . . and he will make me to walk upon mine high places." Is all this grand encouraging language to be restricted to a mere temporal sensible meaning, and confined exclusively to Israel? If so, where is the ancient Scripture testimony to be found concerning Jesus and his Church and kingdom? Where are the prophecies of the grace unto *us* to which the Apostle Peter makes reference (1 Epis. i. 10)—"concerning which salvation?" . . . Certainly St. Paul does not confine the living of the just by faith to the exemption of the Jews from impending slaughter by their Chaldean foes. Surely, then, we may set, "We shall not die" of the Old Testament prophet in the balance over against the utterance of the Old Testament sage, "The dead (*quoad* dead) know not anything."

Let us observe by the way that this famous passage (Eccles. ix. 5) will not really bear the stress that is put upon it; it will not weigh fairly against the other with which we have just contrasted it. For its writer, "The philosopher and preacher of Ecclesiastes, gave his heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things done under heaven; but after every effort he declares the search to be in vain; for, as far as can be learned, 'there is nothing better for a man than to eat and drink, and enjoy the fruit of his labour all the days of his life, for that is his portion; and no man can tell what shall come after.'" (See a well-written article by Mr. Mill in the February RAINBOW, p. 90.) How utterly futile, then, to endeavour to prove the condition of man after physical death, by the words of one who professed that neither he nor any other knew anything of the matter. "In their origin, in their life,

Digitized by Google

in their death, and in their return to dust, the philosopher finds the man and the beast the same. And what may follow afterward 'is hid from the eyes of all living.'" (Ibid.) Is it not true of the Preacher, as of Job's friends, that his "field of vision was limited to the life that now is" (ibid. p. 88); with its complete (apparent) termination in death?

Though it is *not* "contended that the time has come when 'there shall be no more death,'" the reason why we "quote the passage" (2 Tim. i. 10) is, to point to the fact that One who took part of the same flesh and blood with us, through death destroyed him that had the power of death, and *delivered* them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. The word in Timothy rendered "abolished" might perhaps rather be rendered *paralysed*. The first meaning given to the verb in Liddell and Scott is,—"to leave unemployed, or idle." Death, for the believer, has lost its sting, its potency. "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die," saith the Conqueror of Death. And this same word is used in the passage of Hebrews above referred to, of the destruction, or abolition, or it may be paralysis of the devil, whose power is already broken, so that those made captive by him to the fear of death are, by faith in our Lord, liberated from this servitude.

G. A. HAYWARD.

(*To be continued.*)

THE BOOK ECCLESIASTES.

SOME surprise and indignation having been felt and expressed at the statement made by the writer, in a note appended to a short article on "the Constitution of Man," which appeared in the September number of the RAINBOW, that the book Ecclesiastes was of "doubtful inspiration and unknown authorship," we think it well, more especially as this ancient Jewish writing is continually appealed to as *a Divine revelation* regarding such points as the unconsciousness or non-existence of all men after death (chap. iii. 19-21), and the common possession of "spirit" by men and the lower animals alike (iii. 21);* to

* In a noticeable little volume on "Future Punishment," just published, by the Rev. Clement Clemance, of Camberwell,—about which we may have something more to say on another occasion,—we find some not uncalled-for remarks on the unscientific and most unsatisfactory mode of handling the book of God adopted by the generality of writers on the doctrine of "Life in Christ." Mr. Clemance says.—"Scarcely any, if any, notice is taken of the difference in the date or the authorship of the varied books of Scripture. Chapters written in an early age for infantine minds are dealt with as if they were written in precise formulæ; and the first chapters of Genesis are referred to as if they contained a scientific statement of the constitution of man. Had they done so they would have failed of their end for centuries after they were written. We cannot consistently, in the same breath, maintain that the Word of God (especially in its earliest stages) is written in a style not scientific but popular, (as e.g., in regard to astronomy), and then appeal to its rudimentary chapters as if they were not popular but scientific (as regards psychology). Neither should the Book of Job, the Psalms, (Ecclesiastes,) and the prophets be all heaped together without the questions being asked concerning any statement, 'Who said it?' and 'When was it said?' We can never afford to forget the progressiveness of revelation, and unless we distinguished the date and the author of any words which may be

Digitized by Google

transfer to these pages some remarks of the Rev. Samuel Cox on the subject, taken from his valuable exposition of Ecclesiastes entitled: "*The Quest of the Chief Good.*"

Touching the *authorship* of the book Mr. Cox writes as follows:—

"Here, then, we have the book *Ecclesiastes* detached from the other Scriptures, a volume complete in itself, in order that we may thoughtfully and reverently examine it. Among the very earliest questions we have to ask about it are these: Who wrote it? When was it written? To whom was it addressed? What are its main design and scope? All these questions you probably suppose to admit of an easy and distinct reply. Were they asked of you, you would answer, 'Solomon wrote this book: of course, therefore, it was written in his lifetime, and addressed to the race, to that generation of the race, over which he ruled: and his design in writing it was to record his own experience of life for their instruction.' Now if any proof were needed of the profound ignorance of the Bible which afflicts even intelligent Christian men, it might be found in the fact that no one of these answers is true or anywhere near the truth. The Book Ecclesiastes was not written by Solomon, nor for centuries after his death. It was addressed to a generation of feeble and oppressed captives who had been carried out of Judea, and not to the free prosperous nation which rose to its highest pitch in the reign of the Wise King. It is a dramatic representation of what some Jewish Rabbi supposed King Solomon's experience to have been; and its design was to comfort those who were groaning under the heaviest wrongs of time with the hope of immortality.

"To scholars deeply versed in the niceties of Oriental languages, the most convincing proof of the comparatively modern date and authorship of this Book is to be found in its words, and idioms, and style. The base forms of Hebrew and the large intermixture of foreign terms, phrases, and turns of speech which characterise it,—these, with the absence of the nobler rhythmic forms native to the purer Hebrew poetry, are to them a conclusive demonstration that it was written during the Rabbinical period,—at a time long subsequent to that Augustan age in which Solomon lived and wrote. The critics and commentators whose names stand highest tell us that it would be just as easy for them to believe that Hooker wrote Blair's sermons, or that Shakespeare wrote the plays of Sheridan Knowles, or that Lord Bacon wrote Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy—and improbability itself can hardly be stretched beyond that point—as to believe that King Solomon wrote Ecclesiastes. And, of course, on such questions as these we can only defer to the verdict of men who have made them the study of their lives.*

"But with all our deference for learning, we have so often seen the conclusions of the ripest scholars reversed by their successors, and we all know 'questions of words' to be capable of so many opposing interpretations, that probably we should still hold our judgment in suspense were

---

adduced in proof of this position or that, we may make the veriest jumble even of the Book of God."

* Rosenmüller, Ewald, Knobel, De Wette, Delitzsch, Ginsburg, Davidson, and Stanley, and many other competent judges are agreed on this point; and even those who differ, differ only in assigning the book to a date still further removed from the time of Solomon.

Digitized by Google

there no arguments against the common conceptions of Ecclesiastes 'such as plain men use' and can understand. There are many such arguments, however; arguments, as it seems to me, of a most conclusive character.

"As, for instance, this:—The whole social state described in this book is utterly unlike what we know to have been the condition of the Hebrews during the reign of Solomon, but exactly accords with the condition of the captive Israelites who, at the disruption of the Hebrew monarchies, were carried away into Babylon. Under Solomon the Hebrew state was at its best and loftiest. His throne was surrounded by statesmen of a tried sagacity: his judges were incorrupt. Commerce grew and prospered till gold became as common as silver had been, and silver as common as brass. Literature flourished and produced its most perfect fruits. And the people, though heavily taxed during the later years of his reign, enjoyed a security, a freedom, an abundance unknown whether to their father or to their children. 'Judah and Israel,' writes the sacred historian (1 Kings iv. 20, 25), painting a graphic picture with a few rapid touches, 'were many in number as the sands by the sea, eating, and drinking, and making merry. . . . And Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his figtree, from Dan even to Beersheba, all the days of Solomon.' But as we read this book we gather from it the picture of a social state in which kings were childish, and princes addicted to revelry and drunkenness (chap. x. 16); great fools were lifted to high places and rode on stately horses, while the nobles were degraded and had to tramp through the mire (chap. x. 6, 7); the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, nor riches to the intelligent, nor favour to the learned (chap. ix. 11). The most eminent public services were suffered to pass unrewarded and were forgotten the moment the need for them was past (chap. ix. 14, 15). Property was so insecure that to amass wealth was only to multiply extortions and to fall a prey to the cupidity of princes and judges; insomuch that the sluggard who folded his hands so long as he had mere bread to eat was esteemed wiser than the diligent merchant who applied himself to the labours of traffic (chap. iv. 5, 6). Life was as insecure as property, and stood at the caprice of men who were slaves to their own lusts; a hasty word spoken in the divan of any one of the satraps, or even a resentful gesture, might provoke the most terrible outrages (chap. viii. 3, 4; x. 4). The true relation between the sexes was violated; the ruling classes crowded their harems with concubines, and even the wiser sort of men, taking to themselves whatever women they desired; while all, with cynical injustice, first degraded women, and then condemned them as alike and altogether bad, with chains for hands and a snare in place of a heart (chap. vii. 26, 28; ix. 9). The oppressions of the time were so constant, so cruel, and life grew so dark beneath them, that those who died long ago were happier than those who were still alive: while happier than either were those who had not been born to see the intolerable evils on which the sun looked calmly day after day (chap. iv. 1-3). In fine, the whole fabric of the state was fast falling into ruin and decay through the greed and sloth of rulers who taxed the people to the uttermost in order to supply their wasteful luxury (chap. x. 18, 19); while yet, so dreadful was their tyranny and their spies so ubiquitous, that no man dared breathe a word against them even to the

Digitized by Google

wife of his bosom and in the secresy of his bedchamber (chap. x. 20): the only consolation of the oppressed was the grim hope that a time of retribution would overtake their tyrants from which neither power nor craft should be able to save them (chap. viii. 5-8).

"Nothing would be more difficult than to accept this as a picture of the social and political features of the Hebrew state during the reign of Solomon. Nothing could well be more incredible than that this should be intended as a picture of his reign, save that it should be a picture *drawn by his own hand!* To suppose Solomon the author of this book is to suppose that the wisest of kings and of men was base enough to pen a deliberate and malignant libel on himself, his time, and his realm. While, on the other hand, this description, dark and lurid as it is, exactly accords with all we know of the terrible condition of the Jews who wept in captivity by the waters of Babylon. In all probability, therefore, as the most competent authorities are agreed, the book is a parable rather than a history, written by an unknown author, during the captivity, in what is known as the Rabbinical period of Hebrew literature,—certainly not before B. C. 500, and probably somewhat later.*

"Nor is this inference, drawn from the style and general contents of the book, unsupported by verses in it which at first sight seem altogether opposed to such an inference. All the special and direct indications of authorship contained in Ecclesiastes are to be found in the first chapter.

"The very first verse runs, 'The words of the preacher, son of David, king in Jerusalem.' Now David had only one son who was king in Jerusalem, viz., Solomon; the verse therefore seems to fix the authorship on Solomon beyond dispute. Simple and logical as that conclusion seems, it is nevertheless untenable. For observe (1), that in the known and admitted works of the wise king, he distinctly and directly claims the authorship. The Book of Proverbs commences with 'The Proverbs of *Solomon*,' and the Canticles with 'The Song of Songs, which is *Solomon's*.' But the Book of Ecclesiastes does not once mention his name, though it speaks of a 'son of David.' Instead of calling this son of David, 'Solomon,' it calls him '*Coheleth*,' or, as we translate the word, 'the preacher.' Now the word Coheleth is not a masculine noun, as the name of a man should be, but a feminine and abstract noun. It denotes, not an actual man, but an abstraction, a personification, such, for instance, as 'wisdom' or 'virtue;' it implies therefore that it is not the real, but a fictitious Solomon who is about to speak to us, that Solomon is not the author of the book, but a person in the drama it presents. (2.) This 'son of David,' we are told, was 'king *in Jerusalem*;' and in the precise Hebrew use of words the phrase indicates that the book was written at a time when there either were or had been Hebrew kings *out of* Jerusalem, when Jerusalem was not the only site of a royal throne, and therefore after the disruption of Solomon's realm into the rival kingdoms of Israel and Judah. It is even possible that the phrase may imply the book to have been written when there was no longer any king in Jerusalem. (3.) Again, we find Coheleth

* *The fourth century*, B.C., is its most probable date.

Digitized by Google

affirming (ver. 12), 'I *was* king over Israel in Jerusalem,' and (ver. 16) 'I acquired greater wisdom than *all* who were before me in Jerusalem.' Now, to say nothing of the questionable modesty of the latter sentence, if it fell from Solomon's pen, you will observe that it claims for him more than *all* ('all kings,' i.e., say the commentators) who were before him. But when Solomon sat on his throne in Jerusalem, he was only the second occupant of it; for Jebus, or Jerusalem, was only conquered from a Philistine clan by his father David. And if there had been only one, how could he speak of 'all' who preceded him? (4.) And still further, the tense of the verb in that phrase 'I *was* king over Israel' indicates that when the book was written, Solomon was no longer king. It means, 'I was king, but I am king no more.' Yet we know that Solomon reigned over Israel to the day of his death, that there never was a day on which he could have strictly used such a tense as this. So clear and undisputed is the force of this Hebrew verb that even the Rabbis, who held and hold Solomon to be the author of Ecclesiastes, were obliged to invent a tradition to account for its use. And a very pretty pathetic tradition it is. They said: 'When king Solomon was sitting upon the throne of his kingdom, his heart was greatly lifted up within him by his prosperity, and he transgressed the commandments of God, gathering unto him many horses and chariots and riders, amassing much gold and silver, and marrying many wives of foreign extraction. Wherefore the anger of the Lord was kindled against him, and he sent against him Ashmodai, the ruler of the demons; and he drove him from the throne of his kingdom, and took away the ring from his hand (Solomon's ring is famous for its marvellous powers in all oriental fable), and sent him forth to wander about the world. And he went through the villages and cities, with a staff in his hand, weeping and lamenting, and saying, "I am Coheleth; I was beforetime Solomon, and reigned over Israel in Jerusalem; but now I rule over only this staff."' We cannot but love this story for its beauty and pathos; and, though of course we must not accept it as history, we may learn from it that, even in the judgment of the Rabbis, the Book Ecclesiastes must, on its own showing, have been written after Solomon had ceased to be king, i.e., after his death; the Rabbis are 'hoist with their own petard.' So that all the phrases in this book which are indicative of its authorship rather confirm than weaken the inference drawn from its style and contents: viz., that it was not written by Solomon, nor in his reign, but by a Rabbi of a long-subsequent period, who, by a dramatic impersonation of the experiences of Solomon, or of his own experiences combined with the Solomonic traditions, sought to carry comfort and instruction to his oppressed countrymen.

"But perhaps the most convincing argument in favour of this conclusion is, that, when once we think of it, we cannot possibly accept the Solomon set before us in Ecclesiastes as the Solomon depicted in the historical books. Solomon, the son of David, with all his wisdom, played the fool. The foremost man and Hebrew of his time, he gave his heart to 'strange women,' and to gods whose ritual was, not only idolatrous, but cruel, dark, impure. In his pursuit of science, unless the whole East belie him, he ran into secret magical arts,—incantations, divinations, an occult intercourse with demons or supposed demons.

Digitized by Google

In all ways he departed from the God who had enriched him with the choicest gifts, and sank through luxury and excess, first into a premature old age,* and then into a death as hopeless, so unrelieved by any sign of penitence or any promise of amendment, that from that day to this rabbis and divines have discussed his final doom, many of them inclining to the darker alternative. This is the Solomon of history. But the Solomon of Ecclesiastes is a sage who conducts moral experiments for the good of the race, in order that with all the weight of manifold experience he may teach men what is that good and right way which alone leads to peace. Now, however hardly we may think of the wise king who was guilty of so many follies, we can hardly think of him as such a fool that he did not know his sins to be sins, or as such a knave that he deliberately endeavoured to palm them on after ages, not as transgressions of the Divine law, but as a series of delicate philosophic experiments which he was kind enough to conduct for the benefit of mankind. Even if we can conceive of him as thus seeking to cloak and palliate his sins, we may be very sure that the book in which he made so shameless an attempt would not have been admitted into the Sacred Canon.

"On the whole, then, we conclude that, in this book, Solomon is taken as the Hebrew type of wisdom—the wisdom which is based on large varied experience; and that his experience is here dramatised for the instruction of a people who from first to last, from the fable of Jotham to the parables of our Lord, were accustomed to receive moral instruction in fictitious and dramatic forms. Its author was not Solomon, but some unnamed Rabbi; it was written, not in the time of Solomon, i.e. about 1,000 B.C., but some five or six centuries later; and it was addressed, not to the free, wealthy, cultured subjects of the wise king, but to their degenerate descendants, when these were enduring the wrongs and oppressions of the Persian captivity.

"As for the form and design of the book there is no question that it sets before us the quest of the *Summum Bonum*, the search for the chief good. Its main immediate design was to deliver the exiled Jews from the misleading theories of morals current among them, from the sensualism and scepticism caused by their imperfect conceptions of the divine Providence, by showing them that the true good of life is not to be secured by philosophy, by the pursuit of pleasure, by devotion to business, by amassing wealth; but that it results from a temperate enjoyment of the daily gifts of the divine bounty, and a patient endurance of inevitable calamities, combined with the sincere service of God, and a steadfast faith in the future life in which all wrongs will be righted and all problems of providential rule will receive a triumphant solution. Instead of setting forth these truths in a metaphysical treatise, or a moral essay, or even in an authentic biography, our author throws them into a dramatic form. Availing himself of the historical and traditional records of Solomon's life, he depicts him as conducting a series of moral experiments, as testing the claims of wisdom, mirth, affairs, wealth, and as

* Solomon could not have been more than sixty years of age when he died; yet it was not till he was "*old*" that his wives "turned his heart away from the Lord his God."—1 Kings xi. 4.

Digitized by Google

finding them all incompetent to satisfy the cravings of the soul; as attaining no rest or peace until he had learned a simple enjoyment of simple pleasures, a patient constancy under heavy trials, a heart-felt devotion to the service of God, and an unwavering faith in that future life whose dark portal men name Death.'"*

So much for the *authorship* of Ecclesiastes, but what of its *inspiration?*

Of course this disproof of the Solomonic origin of the book,—which is to our mind conclusive,—does not necessarily involve any disproof of its *inspiration*. We do not doubt the inspiration of the Epistle to the Hebrews, because we are pretty sure that it was not written by St. Paul. In the present case, however, we must bear in mind the fact that Ecclesiastes was only admitted into the Jewish Canon on the assumption that it was the genuine work of Solomon, and hence that the disproof of this assumption virtually disproves its right to a place therein. Moreover, even on this assumption, and allowing that it is found in the earliest catalogues which the Jews have transmitted to us of their sacred writings, as Dr. Ginsburg and Professor Plumptre maintain, still it is quite certain that its right to be considered canonical was always more or less questioned among the Jews themselves. Thus we learn from the Talmud that a controversy arose about A.D 65, which turned mainly upon the canonicity of Ecclesiastes, and was not settled till A.D. 90; the great Rabbinical schools of Shammai and Hillel taking as usual opposite sides. "The school of Shammai, who had the majority, opposed; so that the book was probably excluded. (*Adoyot*, v. 3.) The question emerged again at a later synod at Jahneh or Jamnia, when R. Eleasar ben Asaria was chosen patriarch, and Gamaliel the second deposed. Here it was decided, not unanimously however, but by a majority of Hillelites, that Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs 'pollute the hands,' i.e., belong properly to the Hagiographa. (*Yadayim*, v. 3.) This was about A.D. 90. Thus the question of the canonicity of certain books was discussed at two synods.

"Passages in the Talmud have been adduced to show that the Shammaite objections to the canonicity of Ecclesiastes, 'were overruled by the positive declaration from the seventy-two elders, *being a testimony anterior to the Christian era*, that Coheleth is canonical;' but they do not support the opinion.† 'The sages' referred to in the treatise Sabbat and elsewhere is a vague expression, resting apparently on no historic tradition – a mere opinion of comparatively late date. If it refers to the Jerusalem synod A.D. 65, the Shammaites were simply outnumbered there by the Hillelites. The matter was debated hastily, and determined for the time by a majority. But the synod of Jamnia consisted of seventy-two persons; and a passage in the treatise Yadayim refers to it.‡ The

---

* Pp. 7-18.

† "The sages wished to pronounce Coheleth apocryphal, because its statements are contradictory. And why have they not declared it apocryphal? Because it begins with the words of the law, and ends with the words of the law, for it opens with the words, 'What advantage has man in all his labour wherewith he labours under the sun?' &c. &c."—*Sabbat*, 30 *b*.

‡ "R. Simeon ben Asai said, 'I have received it from the mouth of the seventy-two elders in the day that R. Eleasar ben Asaria was appointed elder, that the Song of Songs and Coheleth pollute the hands."—*Yadayim*, v. 3.

Digitized by Google

testimony of the seventy-two elders to whom R. Simeon ben Asai here alludes, so far from belonging to an ante-Christian era, belongs to a date about 90 A.D. And the fact that the synod at Jamnia took up again a question already debated at Jerusalem A.D. 65, proves that no final settlement of the canon had taken place before. The canon was virtually settled at Jamnia, where was confirmed what R. Akiba said of the Canticles in his usual extravagant way; "No day in the whole history of the world is of so much worth as the one in which the Song of Songs was given to Israel; for all the Scriptures are holy; but the Song of Songs is most holy." As the Hagiographa were not read in public, with the exception of Esther, opinions of the Jewish rabbins might still differ about Canticles and Ecclesiastes, even after the synod of Jamnia."*

On these grounds, then, coupled with the facts (1) that the book is never referred to in the New Testament, and (2) that the true character and design of it are among the most difficult of biblical problems, we are, we venture to think, quite warranted in speaking of Ecclesiastes as a book of "doubtful inspiration and unknown authorship." If anything can be said to the contrary let it be said.

* AN OLD STUDENT.

SCRIPTURE TEACHING CONCERNING THE WICKED.

A PAPER READ AT A QUARTERLY MEETING OF BAPTIST AND INDEPENDENT MINISTERS, HELD IN THE BAPTIST CHAPEL, ACCRINGTON.

IN briefly discussing the profoundly difficult theme which forms the subject of this paper, I shall endeavour to confine myself as rigidly as possible to an analysis of the actual statements of Scripture—avoiding all simply philosophical or metaphysical arguments. I am not going to try to show what it would be most appropriate, most just, or most probable that God should do with the wicked. It is alike beside my purpose and beyond my power to attempt the determination of what God *ought* to do. I am not even going to affirm what God WILL do; but simply to show what the Scriptures actually declare on the subject. Let us then inquire—

I. WHAT IS THE DIRECT TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE?

When our first father was placed on his trial in the garden of Eden, the penalty of disobedience to that divine command by which he was forbidden to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was *death*. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Theologians have concluded that the death-penalty here denounced was three-fold. 1. Natural death—the death of the body. 2. Spiritual death, the alienation of the soul from God. 3. Eternal death; in the sense of everlasting torment in hell; but it is inconceivable that the recorded words of the threatening could have conveyed this three-fold idea to Adam. Taking the language as recorded, it is impossible that the threat of death could be understood by Adam to mean an everlasting life in torment. What would be thought of any human law, which, while denouncing death as the penalty of its transgression, should really intend

* Dr. Samuel Davidson, "The Canon of the Bible," pp. 35-38.

Digitized by Google

not the taking away of life, but the infliction of unceasing torture? At all events, taking the words as they stand, they could neither suggest such an idea, nor warrant such a conclusion.

The law of Moses contains no positive and unquestionable evidence on the general question of the destiny of the wicked; but there is this significant fact, that Moses when making his final appeal to the Israelites says: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death—blessing and cursing; therefore, choose life that both thou and thy seed may live." (Deut. xxx. 19.)

The curses which were pronounced upon the Jews in the event of their disobedience were to end in their being destroyed (Deut. xxviii. 20, 21); perishing—being consumed from off the land. The Lord declared that as he had rejoiced over them to do them good, so he would rejoice over them to destroy them, and to bring them to nought, or to exterminate them. (Deut. xxviii. 63.) Now I am fully aware that these penalties were in the main of a temporal character, but then we have to note that during this very important dispensation there was no express hint of any penalty different in its character which was to overtake the transgressor in the world to come—so far as the law could go in the way of suggesting the ultimate issue of sin, death, destruction, perishing was to be its final penalty.

The historical books of the Old Testament may be passed over in this part of our discussion, as also the Book of Job; but the Book of Psalms abounds in evidence concerning the destiny of the wicked: and although it may be said that the light possessed by the writers concerning a future life was very imperfect, it must be borne in mind such light as they did possess was derived from the Holy Ghost; the very spirit of truth. The Holy Ghost spake in David—David wrote in the Spirit (Matt. xxii. 43), a fact abundantly proved by the testimony of Christ and the apostles; such being the case, their light was *real* if incomplete, and their statements must have been in accordance with the truth—not in antagonism to it. Now the teaching of the Book of Psalms is, that the wicked shall be turned into hell (Psa. ix. 17), sheol, the state of death; that the enemies of God shall perish (Psa. xcii. 9); that while the Lord preserveth the righteous, all the wicked will he destroy (Psa. cxlv. 20); that the end of the wicked is that they shall be cast down into destruction (Psa. lxxiii. 15); utterly consumed with terrors (Psa. lxxiii. 18, 19); that they shall be cut off, and shall not be. (Psa. xxxvii. 9.) The Book of Proverbs persistently represents death as the final issue of sin. Thus wisdom is represented as declaring, "Whoso findeth me, findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord; but he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul; all they that hate me love death." The book of Ecclesiastes, while clearly affirming a future judgment, does not declare what the penalty or penalties inflicted by it will be.

The writings of the prophets in their statements concerning the wicked are mainly occupied with the denunciation of temporal judgments; but there is this characteristic declaration in the first chapter of Isaiah. "The destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed;" while in the writings of Ezekiel we have the clearest possible declaration of the death-penalty as attached to sin, "The soul that sinneth it shall die,"

Digitized by Google

(Ezek. xviii.) and the most earnest entreaties to turn from that life of sin which must end in death; and hence it is impossible to exclude the idea of that second death which is the ultimate penalty of sin; for the first death is common to all alike: no life of righteousness could secure exemption from it.

We must now turn to the teaching of the New Testament; and here in the Gospels we come upon the statements of him who is the Truth: he through whom God himself speaks, and he who as the judge of all will have the final doom of the wicked in his own hands. What, then, according to Jesus Christ, is the destiny of the wicked? In the strongest possible manner does Christ declare that the impenitent will be subjected to eternal damnation; that they shall go away into everlasting punishment: words which so far as language can go, affirm the hopelessness, and the irrevocability of the doom of the wicked; but what the doom itself is has to be discovered by such statements as: "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction." (Matt. vii. 13; x. 28.) "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" or life. (Matt. xvi. 26.) "He that findeth his life shall lose it" (Matt. x. 39), which, with all its parables shows that the loss of life the missing of life eternal, is the threatened penalty; it cannot possibly refer to the loss of life at the first death; because it is the preservation of that present life by unfaithfulness to Christ which is the means of exposure to the loss of life denounced in the text. Perishing is the doom from which Christ represents the sinner as being saved. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Of his own sheep he says: "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish. He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him;" i.e., rejecting Christ, he forfeits the everlasting life, and remains exposed to the curse of death, under which sin has brought him.

According to the teaching of Christ, the death, the perishing, and the destruction are to be inflicted by the agency of fire. (Matt. v. 29.) The whole body raised at the last day is with the soul to be cast into hell fire (Matt. x. 28), where both will be destroyed. That fire is declared to be everlasting; a word which, judged by its use in these passages of Scripture, does not teach that the person or thing exposed to its action is indestructible, but that the fire will burn until the person or thing is destroyed, as in the case of the fire which destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.

Other statements of Christ which partake of a metaphorical character will have to be noticed under our next head. Peter when addressing the multitudes in the porch of Solomon's temple, declared that every soul that would not hear Christ, the Prophet like unto Moses, should be *destroyed*. Paul in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, warned his hearers to beware lest this came upon them according to the writings of the prophets: "Behold ye despisers, and wonder and perish."

The writings of Paul abound in statements concerning the destiny of the wicked. Gentile sinners are declared to pursue their vicious courses while knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such

Digitized by Google

things are worthy of death: they who sin without law, are to *perish* without law. The wages of sin is declared to be *death*. To be carnally minded is death, and leads to death: for if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: they who yield their members servants to uncleanness, are warned that the end of these things is death. Of those who are the enemies of the cross of Christ it is declared that their *end is destruction*.

Sudden destruction is to come upon the wicked in the day of the Lord. When the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, it is to be in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord: a most vital passage, because a precise and explanatory parallel to the everlasting fire, and the everlasting punishing of Matt. xxv.

The man of sin, the son of perdition, while consumed with the Spirit of Christ's mouth, is to be destroyed by the brightness of his coming. Paul habitually represents those who reject the Gospel, those to whom the Gospel is hid, and those who are turned from the truth, as perishing.

With the Apostle James, sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. He who converts a sinner from the error of his way, saves a soul from death.

With Peter the alternative of repentance is perishing. With the Apostle John, men are saved from *death* by Christ; they pass from death unto life.

The Book of Revelation is almost exclusively symbolic in its character or metaphorical in its language; but it contains this plain statement, that whosoever was not found written in the book of Life was cast into the lake of fire, which the previous verse had declared to be the second death.

To *die*, to *perish*, to be *destroyed* constitutes, according to the uniform representation of the Old and New Testaments, so far as its positive teaching is concerned, the destiny which is in store for the wicked.

Now it is important to observe that all the strongest verbs in the Hebrew and Greek languages descriptive of the destruction of life are made use of in Scripture to describe the doom which awaits the wicked, as may be seen by a very valuable table contained in Dr. Petavel's "Struggle for Eternal Life," and that the meaning of the Greek words used in the New Testament had been most precisely fixed by their use in Plato's great discussion of the immortality of the soul in the Phædon, where the writer, arguing for the indestructibility of the soul, alleges that that cannot happen to the soul which the New Testament affirms shall happen to the souls of the wicked. This has been proved and illustrated in detail by Edward White in his treatise on Life in Christ.

II. WHAT IS THE TEACHING OF THE METAPHORS OF SCRIPTURE RELATIVE TO THE DOOM OF THE WICKED?

The Book of Psalms is peculiarly rich in such teaching. Psa. i., The ungodly are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. Psa. ii., The enemies of Christ are to be dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel. Psa. vii. 13, If the wicked turn not, God hath also prepared for him the instruments of death. Psa. xi. 6, "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup." Psa. xxi. 9, "Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven in the

Digitized by Google

time of thine anger. The Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them." Psa. xxxvii. 20, "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Psa. xlix. 14, "Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed upon them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling. But God shall redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me;" a very remarkable passage, as anticipating the revelations of the New Testament concerning the resurrection to life of the righteous, while the wicked are relegated to the domain of death.

Psa. xlix. 20, "Man that is in honour and understandeth not is like the beasts that perish." Psa. l. 22, "Consider this, ye that forget God, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver." Psa. lviii. 7-9, "Let them melt away as waters which run continually: when he bendeth his bow to shoot his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces. As a snail which melteth, let every one of them pass away: like the untimely birth of a woman, that they may not see the sun. Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living and in his wrath." Psa. lxviii., "As smoke is driven away, so drive them away: as wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked perish at the presence of God." Malachi iv. 1, "Behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, and it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

John the Baptist warns the Pharisees and Sadducees that the Great One, for whom he acted as forerunner, would throughly purge his floor, gathering the wheat into his garner, but burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

The parable of the tares represents the children of the evil one as being gathered like tares in bundles to be burned.

The judgment of the wicked husbandmen is a being ground to powder by the falling upon them of the headstone of the corner which they had rejected. The guest at the wedding feast, not having the wedding garment, is bound hand and foot and cast into the outer darkness; the weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth expressing the grief, the despair, and the mortification of those shut out from, or deprived of the privileges of the kingdom. The unfaithful servant was to be cut asunder, a capital punishment, when his Lord returned. In Mark ix. 42, 48, the worm which dieth not and the fire which is not quenched are metaphors quoted from Isa. lxvi. 24—"and they shall go forth and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched."

In deciding upon the meaning of these metaphors as used by Christ, it is more reasonable to turn to the use of the same, by the Spirit of Christ, in Isaiah, than to find a sense of our own. Now, in the text from Isaiah the worm is used as the emblem of corruption; its function is not to torment the body of the living, but to feed on the corpse of the dead. When we desire to give the most humbling view of the mortality of man's body, do we not speak of it as destined to be the food of worms? So here corruption is the thing set forth by the worm, and

Digitized by Google

destruction by the fire. This is manifestly the sense in which the words are used by Isaiah, and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the same sense should be supposed in Christ's use of the language.

In the parable of the nobleman going to receive a kingdom, the enemies who would not that he should reign over them were, on his return, brought and slain before him. The bad fish gathered in the Gospel net are *cast away* while the good are preserved for use. In the Epistle to the Romans, the vessels of wrath are fitted to destruction. In the Galatians we read, He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption. In 1 Tim. i., it is affirmed that foolish and hurtful lusts drown men in destruction and perdition. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the writer declares that for the rejectors of the Gospel there remains nothing but a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries; and when warning against apostasy from him who now finally speaks from heaven, the tremendous danger of such a course is argued from the fact that our God is a consuming fire. Peter, in his second epistle, denouncing judgment upon the false prophets and those who were the recipients of their teaching, says, "These as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption."

In the Book of Revelation, having the name blotted from the book of life, exclusion from the tree of life, failing to obtain a crown of life, are the penalties from which faithfulness to Christ was to secure the members of the seven churches. Now it will be observed that there is running through all these metaphorical representations, the one leading idea of a loss of life, a destruction of conscious existence. None of them are adapted to represent the preservation of the wicked in a life of conscious torment to all eternity. There is indeed one passage—Rev. xiv. 10, 11—which speaks of the worshippers of the beast and his image being tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the Lamb, and which declares that the smoke of their torment ascendeth for ever and ever. This passage, taken alone, would certainly appear to favour the popular view; but it must be understood in harmony with the statement that the lake of fire, into which, the beast and the false prophet and all whose names were not found in the book of life were cast, is the *second death*. And it must be remembered that language very similar is used in Isa. xxxiv., concerning the destruction of Idumea, where, speaking of the fire used to destroy it, it is affirmed that it shall not be quenched night nor day. The smoke thereof shall go up for ever: and yet this only meant an irretrievable ruin.

III. WHAT IS THE TEACHING SUGGESTED BY THE ANALOGY OF THE JUDGMENTS RECORDED IN SCRIPTURE?

We are taught in the New Testament that acts of special judgment which are recorded in the Old Testament, happened to those who were the subjects of them for ensamples, and that they were written for our admonition.

The great fact which we have to notice in this connection is that all the extremest acts of judgment have been acts of *extermination*. Those judgments which have not had in them the corrective element, which have not been designed as discipline, have ever been acts of capital

Digitized by Google

punishment. Thus, in the flood, we have the entire destruction of the human race with exception of the single family of Noah. Sodom and Gomorrah and the Cities of the Plain were utterly destroyed; and it is vitally important in this investigation to notice the statement of Jude, when denouncing the judgment of God upon those who turned the grace of God into lasciviousness,—"Even as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, from which we see the Scriptural sense of the phrase, eternal fire. The fire which destroyed Sodom having completed its work of destruction expired; yet it is called *eternal* because of the abiding character of the effect produced by it. The final judgment of God upon Pharoah and his host (all lesser ones having failed to bring him to submission) consisted of an act of overwhelming destruction.

Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and their families rebelling against the authority of Moses, the earth opened and swallowed them up with all their belongings.

The Israelites were doomed to perish in the wilderness on account of their persistent unbelief. Achan with his sons, and his daughters, his oxen, his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, were completely destroyed by fire, after being stoned.

The Canaanitish nations were appointed to complete destruction.

The final act of judgment upon Jerusalem was an act of destruction so complete that not one stone was to be left upon another.

I have not adduced these cases of recorded judgment as containing any positive proof that the ultimate destiny of the wicked will be a real forfeiture of life, an actual destruction of being, but simply as suggesting that such a penalty would in a peculiar degree fall in with the analogy of the divine procedure as set forth in the inspired Scriptures.

IV. THERE REMAINS A VERY IMPORTANT ARGUMENT DRAWN FROM THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE.

No threat of an eternal existence in conscious misery is connected with the penalty of sin as revealed to Adam, and yet if the received doctrine be the true one now, it must have been equally true when the simple penalty of death was announced to our first father.

In the communications made by God to Moses as recorded in the Pentateuch, there is not the faintest hint of a future life of hopeless misery as the ultimate penalty of sin.

The Book of Job deals very extensively with the dealings of God with the wicked, as these were known to, and understood by wise and godly men in patriarchal times, but no trace can be found of the doctrine that the wicked have in store for them an everlasting existence in the torments of hell; and yet had such a doctrine been known, it would have had the most important bearing upon the questions discussed by Job and his friends.

The Book of Psalms is absolutely silent concerning such a fate as awaiting the wicked. The sheol of the Psalms is simply, so far as set forth, the grave; the death-state, answering to the Hades or invisible world of the New Testament. The same may be said of the prophetic writings; for the only passages which at first sight have a contrary

Digitized by Google

appearance will not fairly bear that construction. The scene described in Isaiah xiv., is merely a magnificent piece of dramatic poetry, designed to illustrate the utter impotence to which the great king of Babylon was reduced by death. The passage in Isa. xxxiii. 14, "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" must be read in connection with 8-12, "And the people shall be as the burnings of lime; as thorns cut up shall they be burned in the fire." The passage evidently means, that as thorns could not resist the action of fire, so sinners could not resist the destructive power of the judgments of God.

Now it seems absolutely impossible that the human race should have been allowed to exist for four thousand years, during more than one thousand of which God was at sundry times and in divers manners, making his voice heard, and that yet there should be no clear and unmistakable declaration made of an imperishable life in conscious misery being in store for the wicked, if such a life did really form the penalty of sin. In comparison with such a life, all the judgments plainly and actually denounced sink into the extremest insignificance. I admit that it is not at first sight so manifest that the teaching of Christ is silent concerning an eternal existence of conscious torment; and yet his words taken as a whole do not appear to justify the belief in such a state. It will have been observed that so far no notice has been taken of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, a parable which has so generally been supposed to justify, yea, to demand an adhesion to the popular view. The reason why I have not as yet referred to this parable lies in the fact that if it is designed to throw any light upon a future life at all, it represents the state of a soul in Hades awaiting the judgment, and not the condition of that soul rejoined to the body at the resurrection in order to its being, with it, after the sentence from the great white throne, cast into Gehenna, the Lake of Fire, which is the second death. The writings of Paul, which contain the fullest doctrinal development of the Christian revelation, are absolutely silent concerning an eternal conscious existence after the second death.

The same may be said of the other epistles, and it would seem impossible for this to be the case if the doctrine in question were true. I am aware that in the Book of Revelation there is a passage in the last chapter which describes the wicked as having their characters fixed in connection with the coming of the Lord, and as being without the gates of the New Jerusalem; but this passage appears to relate to the coming of Christ to judgment to reward every man according as his work shall be, and it is supplemented by the statement as to the doom of the wicked contained in chapter xxi. 8: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire, which is the second death." After this death, in point of time, there seems to be no evidence of a continued life of the wicked, so that by the phrase, "he that is unjust let him be unjust still," &c., is not to be understood a perpetuation of *being* with certain attributes of character, but rather that no change can be effected in character after Christ comes to give the final award of the judgment.

The conclusion to which the four preceding lines of argument so clearly

Digitized by Google

point, is yet further strengthened by three very important facts of a negative character relating to the teaching of Scripture.

I. THE SCRIPTURES CONTAIN NO DECLARATION OF THE NECESSARY IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

The popular view of future punishment is built upon, and is alone sustained by the assumption, that all men are immortal; that there is in man a soul or spirit which, if not absolutely indestructible in its nature, will yet never be destroyed; but for this assumption there is no proper ground in Scripture, seeing that in all the more than sixteen hundred places in which the soul or spirit is mentioned, there is not a single case of an adjective denoting immortality being coupled with either word. So far from the Scriptures speaking of man as necessarily immortal, they frequently speak of mortal man, represent immortality as belonging to God only (1 Tim. vi. 16); as attainable by man by patient continuance in well doing (Rom. ii. 7), and as having been brought to light by Christ in the gospel. (2 Tim. i. 10.)

II. THE SCRIPTURES DO NOT ANYWHERE AFFIRM OF THE WICKED THAT THEY SHALL LIVE FOR EVER.

The appeal which we have been so much accustomed to making and to hearing made to the hearers of the gospel, "You *must live for ever*," is never found in Scripture. Their strongest appeal is, "Turn ye, why will ye die?"

III. THE SCRIPTURES NOWHERE SPEAK OF ETERNAL LIFE EXCEPT IN CONNECTION WITH FAITH IN THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND AS BEING DEPENDENT UPON A PERSONAL RELATION TO HIM.

"He that believeth hath everlasting life; because I live ye shall live also; he that hath the Son hath life; I give unto them eternal life."

The length to which this paper has run compels me to leave many points untouched, which it would have been desirable to introduce, and also to leave many objections to the view advocated in it unanswered; but I cannot close without one practical suggestion in relation to the manner in which it is wise to deal with this subject from the pulpit; it is this:—That it is of great importance that we *preach the word*, and not any merely traditionary interpretations of it. God's own words must contain the truth, and if we preach these alone we must be safe; but if we make use of any merely traditional interpretations, we may haply find that we are making God's words void through our traditions, and that in our denunciations of the torments which are to be consciously endured by the lost throughout eternity, we may be unwittingly bearing false witness against God. ALEXANDER STAENSBY.

NOTICES.

"NOTES ON TIMOTHY," several articles, letters, and reviews of books are held over from want of space until next month.

MR. CLEMENT CLEMANCE'S book on future punishment will receive a full review in December.

WE also hope next month to publish, with others, the following papers:—"Behold, I make all things new;" "The Kings of the East;" and "Whose are the curses of Psalm cix. ?"

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

DECEMBER, 1877.

A GRATEFUL RETROSPECT.

THIS number completes the *fourteenth volume* of the RAINBOW. Looking back on the troubled past, and remembering, as we cannot fail to do, the supremely important objects the publication has in view, it requires an effort to realise all that is meant by this fact. Sometimes the heart is too full for utterance. Ideas that press for speech are forced back. So it is in this case. Gratitude to the LORD, whose truth we have laboured to vindicate, and to those of his followers who have from time to time held up our hands in the sore conflict, is too profoundly felt to be put in words. The sympathy of our friends with the design of this long continued labour will lead them to put the right interpretation upon silence. We must not trouble them with details which, of necessity, are to a great extent personal, although it were easy to show that the personal in this case has to do not with self or the individual, but with the character and the very existence of the Magazine.

Whatever mistakes in the interpretation of Scripture, or short comings in logical accuracy, may be found in the eight thousand and sixty-four pages of these fourteen volumes we claim for our honoured co-workers and ourselves the benefit of the important fact that we have sought the vindication and establishment of revealed truth in entire independence of all the churches and creeds in the world. The writers in the RAINBOW have not thought either as "Churchmen" or "Dissenters," but as men who fear GOD, and who know that his truth will live gloriously when those sectarian distinctions will have passed into oblivion with all the other foolish things that have so long and so painfully proved the imperfection of humanity. We have neither praised nor censured existing forms of ecclesiasticism, but have sought, with unwearied earnestness, to separate Christian *doctrine* from the errors which have for centuries clung to it, impairing its beauty and weakening its strength. This has been our object; and under the blessing of GOD, whose

Digitized by Google

leading hand we this day recognise with deep thanksgiving, our labour has produced results which will beneficially influence thousands of minds when we shall rest from labour. There is no hazard in this assertion. Existing facts point to it as an absolute certainty.

With our eyes perfectly open to the fact that a periodical meant to show the necessity of supernatural intervention in the dreadfully confused affairs of church and world,—namely the personal return of the Son of God to claim his inheritance,—must offend human pride, and secure but scant audience, we could not think of commercial success, or even of a self-sustaining circulation at first; but we *did* think that the time had come to give thoughtful men an opportunity of discussing matters which were yearning for utterance, but which could find no appropriate channel in magazines or papers committed to certain lines of ecclesiastical policy. We felt that if the effort were made, it *might* be appreciated by such brethren; and that if the journal did not die in infancy for want of nourishment, the time must come in a very few years—considering the awakening of thought on all hands to questions which had slept for ages—when its services would be deemed indispensable by an increasing number of earnest students in the school of Christ.

That impression was right. The time has come. The true idea of the CHURCH, the meaning of the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, the nature of MAN, the special object of REDEMPTION, and the character of GOD, are subjects of supreme importance to all, and they are engaging the attention of Christians now as they never did before. The RAINBOW has therefore an unspeakably important sphere of service, and those who value that service will surely welcome it to their homes, and enlarge the circle of its testimony. They will smile upon it, and let it live and work for our divine faith and our divine LORD, and he shall have all the glory for the light it may shed upon the problems which yet wait solution.

For the work is not yet done. Very far from it. It is but begun, there is so much to do. Many errors in theology remain to be exposed, and many truths in the Bible to be explained and vindicated; whilst the protean forms of modern scepticism, so apt to deceive the unwary, must be watched and unmasked by a criticism as keen as that of the adversary—loyalty to eternal truth being its impelling motive. Two or three new writers, richly qualified for the noble work, have joined us during the year; and we have reason to believe that their valued services will be continued; and also that papers from other well instructed scribes will gratify our readers, and add to the literary and theological value of the magazine during the coming year. Nothing that we can do shall be left undone to make the RAINBOW all that can be desired as an earnest and fearless witness for truth. By the hearty assistance of the friends of truth and the blessing of God, it has a work to do of the

Digitized by Google

highest possible value to multitudes in this and other lands. And now it only remains that we respectfully and earnestly ask all our esteemed subscribers to renew their subcriptions, and to help in every possible way the glorious doctrinal reformation, the promotion of which is our duty and privilege, our honour and joy. *A happy Christmas and New Year to every reader of these lines.*

EDITOR.

"BEHOLD! I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW."

REV. xxi. 5.

BY GENERAL H. GOODWYN.

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven (firmament) fled away; and there was found no place for them."—Rev. xx. 11.

"Behold! I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind."—Isa. lxv. 17.

I. THIS paper may serve as a supplement to my last in the September number, as well as an explanatory statement of Rev. xx. 11-15, a passage that, I think, is not generally viewed in a light that harmonises with the words of my heading. It is, moreover, not appreciatively understood to give emphatic proof of the ultimate "passing away," the blotting out from memory, entire dissolution or extinction of the economy of this earth and its firmament, inclusive of the lake of fire and every person and thing subjected to it.

II. I remark first with reference to the earth, that all that is of an explosive nature, air and water, shall "*pass away* with a great noise." All that has already been under the action of fire, rocks and metals, "shall melt with fervent heat;" whilst all that has not yet been thus subjected will be "burnt up." Thus writes an apostle (2 Peter iii. 10-12), in whose language there is no ambiguity; he does not say that these things may be, but he rises above all earthly or scientific levels, tramples under the feet of INSPIRATION all scepticism, and proclaims that "ALL these things SHALL BE dissolved!" Is not this a counterpart of ver. 11 of Rev. xx., "the earth and the firmament *shall flee away* from the face of him who sitteth on the throne?" Again, "Behold! a NEW earth and a NEW firmament: for *the first earth and its firmament were passed away*," "the former *shall not be remembered, nor come into mind!*" Not the old earth repaired or purified; such is not the way of THE FATHER OF GLORY when he prepares an inheritance for the Son of his love. (Compare Ephes. i. 15-23.) In that word "NEW," he enunciates his principle of action in connection with every person and thing that belongsto a *New* Creation, the expan-

Digitized by Google

sive outgrowth of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for *the abolition of sin* in the aggregate (Rom. viii. 3), and his resurrection into a "newness of life."

This Divine principle is carried out with reference to the effects of sin; in evidence of which we are instructed that the Adam nature has so thoroughly tainted "the blood which is the life" of man, that God has never given forth a thought of its amelioration by any process whatever. His decree is that "the old man" *must be put to death* and be *buried* out of sight; must cease to exist in fact and in memory. (Rom. vi. 4-6; Ephes. iv. 22-24.) Moreover, that a *new* man must take his place. The Apostle Paul remarking on this doctrine in 2 Cor. v. 17 says, "old things have passed away; Behold! ALL THINGS are become new." Precisely the words at the head of this paper, upholding a Divine rule of procedure. It will be undeviatingly carried out in respect to the present sin-polluted dwelling place of man, of which it is written "the earth and the heavens the works of Thy hands SHALL PERISH." (Heb. i. 10-12.) The Lord Jesus must have borne witness to this law when he said that *new* cloth was not to be pieced on to an old garment, neither *new* wine to be put into old bottles, for fear of accidents, But new wine should be put into new bottles, that *both might be preserved.*

III. I pass on now to remark on the assize before the Great White Throne, that it does not relate to *the period* of the return from Heaven of him who was seen to sit upon it, viz., the Lord Jesus as Son of Man, into whose hands "all judgment is committed;" he will have come one thousand years before that event (see Rev. xix. 11, &c.); his purpose being, as declared by the apostle, to "judge the quick and the dead at his appearing," and during the thousand years' duration of "his kingdom." (2 Tim. iv. 1.) The judgment of the dead is not till "The thousand years are finished" (Rev. xx. 5), during which period he will have been engaged in judicial action connected with "the quick" or living men, of which Psa. ii., cxlix., with Rev. xx. 7-10 are evidences.* This statement further proves that the resurrection to the assize before the Great White Throne is not a general one, but that of John v. 29, "unto condemnation," *contrasted with* another "unto life." John shows a distinction of Resurrection *as to character*, the Book of Revelation *as to time.*

(2.) This assize of the dead raised to condemnation is the last judicial scene in the kingdom of the Son of man. What must follow? Necessarily the sentence and the execution. Long delayed because of the grace and forbearance of God; but now about to be pronounced in vindication of his ways when he once judged SIN on the cross of his own Son. (Rom. viii. 3.) "*To put away*

* See the writer's "Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ," pp. 307-311, the judicial character of the Millenial kingdom.

Digitized by Google

SIN by the sacrifice of himself," was the object (Heb. ix. 26) for which the eternal Son assumed "*the likeness* of sinful flesh;" and shall not that object be fulfilled? The sentence against SIN, I repeat, has been long delayed, but the time will have come at length, and the Word of God must be verified in the entire extinction of SIN, ALL SIN, and every unredeemed person and thing that has been in any form or way tainted by it.

IV. In order to render the sentence and execution clear I now draw attention to the passage in Rev. xx. 11-15; and first of its arrangement. The Spirit of Truth in the Scriptures sometimes records a plenary action, and oft the collective entirety of the Divine purposes at the beginning of a passage, supplementing that aggregate afterwards by a statement of its components. Such is the case in Ephes. i. 3-7, where ver. 3 states the perfected condition of the children of God, attained to by the means afterward related in ver. 4-7. Heb. xii. 22-24 is another instance. Now ver. 11 of Rev. xx. does not only stand in the same relationship to ver. 3 of Ephes. i., it is the epitome of the closing judicial action of the millennial kingdom (§ III. 2): a compendium enfolding within itself the full details of ver. 12-15, *with the resultant effect thereof*, viz., the entire extinction, the "passing away" out of sight and of mind of the present earth, the gigantic graveyard of the world, and its firmament! That the language of ver. 11-15 is not figurative is plain enough—the earth and heavens have now a "place," but that "place is *no more to be found*;" and Isaiah says that they are now known, but the memory of their existence *will be no more!*

Again, is it not beyond question that the earth and the sea could not be giving up their dead *after they had fled away?* Thus the resurrection of "the rest of the dead" (Rev. xx. 5) seems to take place first; then the sentence of DEATH the second time, the "everlasting punishment" of "destruction from the presence of the Lord" then sitting on the Great White Throne (compare 2 Thess. i. 9 with Rev. xx. 11); and when the execution takes place by the consumption of the *carcases** in the lake of fire, *then* the whole fabric of this earth and its atmosphere vanishes by the power of the Word of God who brought it into existence.

V. In conclusion, I cannot help remarking that I have not used the word "annihilation," though I fail to see the nicety of distinction between the Scriptural expressions at the head of this paper and that word, of which there seems to be a needless fear. The wicked heathen in their end "SHALL BE AS THOUGH THEY HAD NOT BEEN!" (Obad. 16.) See also Psa. lviii. 7-11; xxxvii. 10. If these words do not express annihilation, I shall be glad to be supplied with a suitable word as an equivalent.

---

* The spirits, or principle of life, being taken back to God who gave them. (Eccles. xii.)

Digitized by Google

I am here reminded of a statement that "the last conflagration shall reduce this globe (?) to its original constituent elements, without destroying it." Quere: What were the original constituent elements of the earth? Answer: Heb. xi. 3!

Wellington House, Clevedon.

PATIENCE.

"Ye have need of patience."

THOU hast abundant time, O Lord,
To carry out thy plans;
And wisdom in thy mind is found
Far greater than in man's.

Impatient of the thousand ills
That make creation groan,
We wonder thou canst bear so long
To hear its doleful moan.

It makes thy children sad to see
The wrongs they cannot right,
And ask how long wilt thou endure
The heaven-offending sight?

"How long, O Lord?" we need not ask,
For this is the reply,—
The times are in the hands of God,
Most Holy and Most High,

We run and rush, in foolish haste,
Through life's allotted span;
He, with divine tranquillity,
Evolves his perfect plan.

A thousand years, as mortals count,
With him are but a day;
His space is ample for his will
To have its blessed way.

Our need is patience; we must wait
The Lord's appointed hour;
He only knows the proper time
To exercise his power.

And when that comes, the Lord will come
To dry creation's tears,
And give his people peace and joy
Eternal as his years.

Digitized by Google

THE HEATHEN WORLD.

WAS the ancient heathen world really left in such utter darkness as regards the knowledge of the one true God as we of this age are apt to suppose? I for one very much doubt it; I think that many proofs to the contrary may be given alike from Scripture, from reason, and from historic facts.

In the first place, then, we have numerous instances in the Scriptures of heathen monarchs, and of others,—both before and after the giving of the Law of Moses,—appealing and referring to Jehovah, as the one true God. In the Book of Genesis, for example, we read of God appearing to Abimelech, the King of Gerar, and the answer of Abimelech which is given Gen. xx. 4-6, from which it is clearly shown that Abimelech was not without knowledge of the truth, and yielded some obedience to Jehovah, the God of truth. We have, again, the instance of the children of Heth recognising Abraham as the servant of Jehovah, and respecting him on that account. Nay, in the above case of Abimelech we actually have this heathen monarch reproving, and that with justice and righteousness, the servant and prophet of Jehovah.

Above all, we have the very remarkable case of Melchizedek, King of Salem; who, as "priest of the Most High God," must have taught the inhabitants of Jerusalem,—who in those days were what we should call heathen,—and from whose instruction without doubt a marvellous amount of divine light must have shone on all the surrounding nations. And we have also the case of Job and his friends, all of whom were more or less acquainted with the true God.

In our Lord's own words, again, which gave such offence to the Jews,—"Many lepers were in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian,"—it is clearly implied that God's goodness and consequently a more or less right knowledge of him was to be found among the heathen nations. We have also the case of the prophet Balaam, who was not only a prophet of the Most High, but was recognised as such by many of the nations around.

We have also some extraordinary instances of a knowledge of Jehovah being possessed, in part at least, even by some of the heathen monarchs from whom we should least have expected it. Thus we find Necho, King of Egypt, warning Josiah not to come against him, for God had given him a command to go out and fight and to make haste, and (2 Chron. xxxv. 22) the remarkable statement is added: "Josiah hearkened not unto the words of Necho *from the mouth of God.*" So again, we find Cyrus, King of Persia, saying: "The Lord God of heaven .... hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem" (Ezra. i. 2). We find Hiram, King of Tyre, saying: "Blessed be the Lord, which hath given unto David a wise son" (1 Kings v. 7); and we also find the same

Digitized by Google

Hiram co-operating and gladly assisting to build the temple of Jehovah. We find the King of Nineveh repenting at the preaching of Jonah, and all the Ninevites recognising Jonah as a prophet of God." We find, after the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, "the captain of the guard" of that monarch—who was of course a heathen—saying: "The Lord thy God hath pronounced this evil upon this place. Now the Lord hath brought it, and done according as he hath said; because ye have sinned against the Lord, and have not obeyed his voice" (Jer. xl. 2, 3).

With regard to the Persian religion, Mr. Rawlinson remarks: "The main feature in the early state of this religion was the acknowledgment and worship of a single supreme God,—the Lord God of heaven (2 Chron. xxxvi. 23; Ezra i. 2). The spirit of the Zendavesta is wholly averse to idolatry, and we may fully accept the statement of Herodotus, that 'images of the gods were entirely unknown to the Persians.' It was during this time of comparative purity, when the anti-idolatrous spirit was in full force, that a religious sympathy seems to have drawn together the two nations of the Persians and the Jews. Cyrus evidently identified Jehovah with Ormazd,—note especially the phrase 'He is *the* God,' Ezra i. 2, 3. The foundation was thus laid for that friendly intimacy between the two peoples of which we have abundant evidence in the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther." *

The wise men from the east who came to worship our Lord were Magi, who, we are told, had been warned by God in a dream.

We have thus many proofs that God was never so utterly unknown to his creatures as we are apt to imagine. But perhaps the greatest proof of all that he was not so, is afforded by the fact that everywhere and in all ages, men in times of distress appeal directly to God himself to help them; and in every mythology there have been found clear traces of an Almighty Being above and superior to all the "gods many" of such mythologies. Indeed the conviction that there is a God above, who has made us and sustains us, is one which nothing can long or wholly destroy; and I feel certain that in all the nations of old there existed such a belief. "In India at the present day, overrun as it appears to be with the grossest idolatries, the Hindu mind still retains the impress of a purer faith. It is a most note-worthy circumstance that as regards the Hindus their ever-growing polytheism has never been able to banish an impression of one supreme God. In India you hear the people speak of Ishmar (God) or Parera Ishmar (the great God), but you never hear them use these terms in the plural number."† In fact, look where we will, we find everywhere some knowledge, more or less pure, of the one true God; corrupted it may be and distorted, but still not entirely destroyed. I cannot but believe

* Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies.
† Gleig's "Great Problem," pp. 66.

Digitized by Google

that the institution of sacrifice, found as it has been in so many heathen nations, is a proof that they were acquainted through their fathers with the sacrifices originally offered to Jehovah. And I also think that the very name Jupiter, i.e., Zeus Pater, (or Zeus, the Father), which was the name in use among the Greeks and Romans, proves that a recollection of the fact that God was the Father of all men had not entirely been lost. I think that the words Jovis, Jove, &c.,—the genitive and other cases of the word Jupiter in use among the Romans,—point to a remembrance of the word Jehovah, the self-existent One.

Again, the hope of a Messiah to come; of some Great One who should deliver the groaning and troubled earth from its many evils, seems always to have been found in some form or other, and it seems most probable that this hope arose originally from the promise given to our first parents. The descendants of Noah must have carried with them into all the places where they went after the flood, the records and accounts of that catastrophe, and of the revelation of God to Noah.

In an able work recently published by Mr. Gleig, the following remarks are made on this deeply interesting point. After showing that there is much reason to believe that the early Vedic Hymns of India were probably inspired by the revelation originally made by the Deity, Mr. Gleig observes: "It is impossible for those who believe in a primitive revelation, who discover in the oldest of the Vedic Hymns the outpourings of devotion as deep and pure as in the Psalms of David, . . . it is impossible to suppose that throughout the unnumbered centuries which preceded the coming of Christ, the Spirit of God held no communion with the spirits of men, except within the narrow limits of one favoured nationality. On the contrary, every teacher of everlasting verities, every moral regenerator of the world, in whatever age he may have lived, in whatever land he may have laboured, deserves to be called an inspired man. Who can doubt that so far as each taught his disciples to worship the unseen God in their lives rather than with their lips, he obeyed the impulses of that Holy Spirit" who worketh hitherto and shall never cease to work?

How, for instance, is it, or has it ever been possible for Gentiles to "do by nature the things contained in the Law" unless they had some knowledge of the true God? How can any good thing exist unless it come from God? Whence come our emotions of pity, of tenderness and love, except from him who is the fountain of all these beautiful feelings, feelings which "bear witness with our spirit" that they are from the Spirit of God.

Moreover, St. Paul tells the Athenians that "God had never left himself without witness." The very "rain from heaven and fruitful seasons filling men's hearts with food and gladness," have ever been witnesses to the true God. At all events "his eternal power and Godhead" might be clearly known from Nature itself,

Digitized by Google

and thus a partial knowledge of God obtained by all. And who can doubt that with very many among the so-called heathen there was a large degree of knowledge and even worship of Jehovah left? Moreover, it is not, I think, true even in other respects that God had left himself without witness; for although the heathen world had not, as the Jews had, *prophets* to tell them the will of God, they were not as a rule left without some sort of substitute. They had their *poets* who very frequently became, as a matter of fact, their guides and teachers, and were permitted by God not seldom to show them of their errors and make them at all events *aspire* to better things. The word *Vates* is used both for a poet and for a prophet, and indeed true poetry is a kind of prophecy. St. Paul, for instance, in his address to the Athenians, makes the whole stress of his argument turn upon the truth of the words of a heathen poet, "For we are also his offspring."*

These words just quoted are very wonderful and sublime, and indeed seem almost to soar above some of the utterances of the Jewish prophets. They are words full of comfort, full of hope to the race of man, and St. Paul having quoted them with approval, they become to us the voice of inspiration. Nor is this the only case in which St. Paul quotes the poetry of heathen writers. To the Corinthian Church he quotes the true words of Menander: "Be not deceived, . . . evil communications corrupt good manners." Who can doubt, therefore, that St. Paul saw and recognised in many of the writings of the heathen poets something higher and truer than we are accustomed to think was the case?

Many of the heathen poets also use expressions wonderfully near to those of inspiration. Take, for instance, the words of the Latin poet Horace,—

> "Cum tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis,
> Cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutum."

"When you overlook your own vices, winking at them as it were with sore eyes, why are you so sharp-sighted with regard to the vices of your friends?" How exactly this agrees with our Lord's words: "How wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me cast out the mote from thine eye; and, behold, the beam is in thine own eye?" The poets of those ages were frequently permitted by God to be in some sense witnesses to truth and goodness, and to show the people of their abominations and corruptions.

It is also a singular fact that the warnings and threatenings in the Scriptures of the Old Testament are by no means confined to the Jewish nation; on the contrary there are often whole chapters, not to say whole books, especially devoted to the neighbouring heathen nations. In Jer. i. 5, we read: "Before thou wast born I sanctified thee and ordained thee a prophet *unto the nations*." (Gen-

* Alford says, that *two* of the Greek poets, viz., Aratus and Cleanthes, both utter this beautiful truth.

Digitized by Google

tiles, ἔθνη, *Sept.*) Is it to be supposed that the nations to whom these warnings were directed never heard them nor knew anything about them? Such a supposition is simply incredible. We may be quite certain that the name and character of Jehovah, the God of Israel, were more or less familiar to these nations.

When the Queen of Sheba and "all the kings of the earth" came from their own countries to hear the wisdom of Solomon they must surely have carried back with them no small measure of divine knowledge and truth, for it is impossible not to suppose that Solomon and the great magnificence of the temple must have been the subjects of conversation in all the habitable parts of the earth, and with the name of Solomon the name of Jehovah must also have become familiar. In Deut. iv. 6, we read: "Keep therefore and do these commandments, for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." Moses, therefore, assumes that these surrounding nations would hear and appreciate the laws and ordinances of the true God; and indeed had the Jews only "let their light shine before men" as they ought to have done, the strong contrast afforded by their conduct *must* have completely converted the neighbouring nations.

We have every reason, therefore, to believe that the oracles of God though entrusted primarily to the Jews were by no means unknown to the Gentiles; the divine light shone upon the latter at least as a reflected light; nor is this fact at all inconsistent with the declarations of St. Paul, in the Acts, that God, "in times past, suffered all the Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) to walk in their own ways;" and that "the times of this ignorance God passed over;" since the apostle would seem in these passages to be speaking generally and comparatively, and of a direct rather than a transmitted knowledge.

Now the point which has for us the greatest interest and importance is this: that so far as we can form any judgment on the matter, God deals and always has dealt with the heathen world on precisely the *same general principles* as with the Jews. The amount of chastisement and the form of it may indeed vary, but the exact principle is this: "To whom much is given, of them will much be required." Those who had not a clear knowledge of right and wrong are not treated as those who have. Vengeance does not fall on the Sodomites, so long as there are even ten righteous in the city, and even then the Lord says to the one righteous man there, viz., Lot, "I cannot do anything till thou be come thither," i.e., out of Sodom. The Canaanites are not destroyed until their iniquity had become intolerable. The Jews are not allowed to go up against them till "the iniquity of the Amorites is full," and even then God takes advantage, as it were, of the rebellion of the Jews to give the Canaanites another forty years respite. It was

Digitized by Google

only when human sacrifices and orgies of the most revolting character became the rule and not the exception among them, that the command was given to drive them out. To the Jews, on the other hand the Lord says, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore will I punish you for your iniquities;" implying that those who had greater privileges would have more to answer for. We thus gather from Scripture and from fact that God never entirely deserts any of his creatures, but that each and all are more or less cared for by him, and that everywhere and in all nations it is possible to approach him in a greater or less degree. We are thus led to see that "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." In fact, in days of old just as it is now, everything that is good, everything that is true, must have proceeded from that Spirit of God who is himself the truth. We should learn then to respect and appreciate justice and truth wherever they are to be found; "proving all things, and holding fast that which is good."

Thus we have seen that a knowledge of God was possessed in the heathen world by many, and in places where we should least have expected it; and just so at the present day it is more than possible that we may miss the knowledge of many truths which it is desirable we should know, because we refuse to believe that God acts otherwise than through orthodox channels. We should always be ready to learn from any source, and to confess truth wherever we recognise it to be such. The best of us have much to learn and much to unlearn before we can attain the truth.

We should not, like the Jews in our Lord's time, be too ready to say, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Rather should we follow Philip's advice, "Come and see." Neither light nor truth is confined to any one sect, any one church, any one nation, nor assuredly to any one man. These may exist, and no doubt did exist of old, to a much greater extent among the Jews than among the Gentiles, but still these last had *some* light and *some* truth entrusted to them also.

* T. W.

NOTES ON 2 TIMOTHY III., IV.

No. III.

THE first characteristic given by the apostle of the evil men of the last days is that they should be "philautists" (φίλαυτοι). Here our own version uses five words—"lovers-of-their-own-selves"—to express one, and fails; for it is no offence to love oneself. "No man ever yet hated his own flesh." But, curiously enough, in 1611 there was no English word to express the familiar fault here indicated. Scholars in vain attempted to bring the Greek

Digitized by Google

term itself into use, as "philauty;" one writer, with equal want of success, suggested "suicism," or seeking-one's-own things (*sua*). But it was not until about 1640 that the Puritan divines coined the word "selfish," which exactly expresses the meaning of the Greek term. Selfishness, therefore, at this time will be a pre-eminently ruling motive; there will still be a form of religion, and necessarily attached to it an infinite amount of hypocrisy. The bad old saying, "Every man for himself," with its conclusion, "and God for us all," to give a spurious decency to the first part, will be a ruling maxim of the time. There is nothing surprising or unnatural here; the world does not, and will not, become easier to live in; the struggle for existence may readily be vastly intensified; and those who have not learned the truth and power of that habitual remark of the Lord Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," cannot fail under pressure to become "philautists."

These evil men shall also be silver-lovers (φιλάργυροι), i.e., covetous (vide Jas. v. 3, before noticed); and "braggarts" (ἀλαζόνες). This latter term, like countless others in Holy Scripture, is replete with meaning. *Alè* is a wandering, a homeless roaming, and Sophocles applies it to the flitting of ghosts, *lost* souls; but it is also used of the mind and thus signifies an *error mentis*, a wandering from truth and reason. *Alazòn* is one who wanders, a vagabond; and as evil wanderers are renowned for lying, boasting, "traveller's wonders," and the like, it next comes to mean a braggart. Those spoken of by the apostle, therefore, will have wandered from the truth, and not only so, but the very circumstance that they have thus done, have run the round of human knowledge God-unaided, will make them boastful; though, like a weary traveller lost on boundless plains, their doubtful and circling journey but brings them at last to their starting point. Many such "thinkers," as the term is, have confessed that ultimate truth is "unknowable," that whence we came, what we are, why here, whither going, are questions insoluble. And yet the possessors of this dreary wealth of ignorance, these mental vagabonds, will look down with supreme contempt on the humble believer in Jesus, will laud the vain efforts of the human mind to penetrate "the veil that is spread over all nations;" in a word—are braggarts. To be a mental wanderer, without hope and without God in the world!—terrible condition! To boast of such a state is indeed to glory in our shame. To be a star in this age's galaxy, how little will it avail if nothing but a wandering star, to whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved.

The next characteristic given of the men of the last days is that they will be "self-exalting" (ὑπερήφανοι). The term implies people who labour to make themselves conspicuous, are overweening, bear themselves proudly. Humanity, i.e., mankind in themselves, with their present capacities and capabilities, is already rapidly becoming the divinity of many. Man must be exalted, must be everything; God, even if his existence be coldly conceded, must be made a

Digitized by Google

nullity, must retire to the background nor be permitted to interfere practically in any way in the government of the universe. No wonder then that the men of the last days shall be self-exalting, the exact opposite to the standpoint of the believer in Christ.

Men at this time will also be "blasphemers." They *must*, in the nature of things, be such: "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and marvellous things will then be spoken against the truth, his cause, and church (cf. Dan. xi. 36; Jude 15; Apoc. xiii. 5, 6). But Christ's waiting and watching people shall escape the worst part of this trial; he will hide them in the secret of his presence from the pride of man, this self-exalting feature of the evil time, and keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues.

"Disobedient to parents." The old foundations of social order the good old usages which nature teaches, will be boldly and systematically invaded and impinged upon by those who will think to change times and laws. In days gone by parental authority has often been unduly strained, and the pendulum of the human mind, ever oscillating between extremes, constantly avenges excess in one direction by subsequent excesses in the opposite.

"Unthankful" (ἀχάριστοι). Instead of being *eucharistoi*, or in that state of holy thankfulness which fits men to perform the Eucharistia, that special rite of sacred rejoicing in which the believer looks back to the First Advent and forward to the Second (1 Cor. xi. 26). The expression, like many others, seems to be very deeply significant, and not merely to imply that they will be generally "thankless" and ungrateful though this is of course included, but that they will be devoid of all thankfulness to God for the gift of his Son and the blessings thereby secured to his people.

"Unhallowed" (ἀνόσιοι). *Hosios* is that which is in accordance with the law of God and his teaching in and by nature (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 13); that which is sacred and sanctified. A word very similar in signification to the term here used of the men of the last days is applied to the myths which are to be rejected. *Anosioi* also signifies persons who are regardless of sacred obligations, despisers of their duty towards God.

"Without-natural-affection, covenant-breakers, slanderers" (διάβολοι). This last peculiar term is applied to Judas (John vi. 70), but is the special appellation of "the Great Dragon, the Old Serpent, who is called Diabolos and Satan" (Apoc. xii. 9), and is never used of any other supernatural being, or in the plural except when men are intended. There is but *one* Diabolos, the great father of lying and the lie (Jno. viii. 44). The beings spoken of in the Gospel narratives are called dæmons; they are said to believe and tremble (James ii. 19). Some are to give heed to their teachings (1 Tim. iv. 1); at a certain time they appear to have miraculous powers (Apoc. xvi. 14). But these are distinct from the wicked men here alluded to, for just as Christ's people, rising in

Digitized by Google

the scale of excellence, receive his nature, so Satan's people, sinking in the scale, become more and more *diaboloi*, miniatures of *the* Slanderer.

"Powerless" (ἀκρατεῖς), i.e., over themselves. Temperance has been beautifully defined as "Fortitude under trial by pleasure;" but these men have no self-control, are the servants of corruption, serving divers lusts and pleasures, and consequently led captive by the slanderer at his will.

"Savage, unfriendly-to-the-good, traitors, hasty (προπετεῖς, lit. 'falling forward,' fools rushing in), puffed-up-with-pride" (τετυφωμένοι). This last epithet applies primarily to the swelling up of smoke or rolling of mist, the emblem of the vanishing earth-life (Jas. iv. 14); and also to the obscurity and confusion produced by mists mental and physical. As above noticed, the wanderers, the vagabonds, are braggarts, and so, though wrapped in mist and confusion, they are puffed up with pride.

"Pleasure-lovers (phil-hedonists) rather than God-lovers." Here, again, let us glance at circumstances around in connection with this particular clause of the prophecy. The surface meaning of the statement requires no comment; but there is more in it than may at first sight appear. What should we say to a religion of pleasure, one which placed before man pleasure (Hedone), however that term may be conceived or defined, as the great end and aim of life? The votary of this faith would be a phil-hedonist. His object might not necessarily be any pleasure such as is generally admitted to be base and degrading; but refined, intellectual, and moral pleasure, the central feature of all which however consists in the gratification of a man's own *natural* wishes, ideas, and aims, the triumph of his opinions, the success of his efforts; a mental frame having nought akin with that most divine of supplications, *Non mea voluntas, sed tua fiat.* And now, turning from St. Paul to the literature of to-day, we find one of the most important works in the intellectual world is called *The Methods of Ethics*, written by a very distinguished man, and in which human reason and wisdom endeavour in their own strength to find out what we *ought* to do. Now this inquiry, if God, his Word, and will are summarily removed from the field, is a very difficult one. A believer may say at once, and without doubt, that the great end of existence is to glorify God and to enjoy him for ever. But an unbeliever or an agnostic (a favourite phrase of the time), one who says he *does not know* whether there be a God and the like—not the fool absolute, who broadly states, "There is no God"—what end or aim of being has he before him, and how can he justify it for himself, or still more convincingly recommend it to the acceptance of others? I am not concerned with the self-created difficulties of such persons: those who wish to see how, in such matters, the changes can be rung upon words, how definitions leave us only more perplexed, how hard it is from such a standpoint to give any meaning at all to the crucial word "ought," how difficult

Digitized by Google

it is to confute the gross Egoist, who declares boldly, 'I ought to do what I like: I like what you choose to call crimes and vices, therefore I ought to do them.' Such inquirers I would refer to a pamphlet by Mr. F. H. Bradley, of Merton College, Oxford, entitled, "Mr. Sidgwick's Hedonism; an examination of the main argument of 'the Methods of Ethics.'" "For him [Mr. Sidgwick]," says Mr. Bradley, "the end is the sum of the pleasures of the sentient creation, or, at the least, of humanity"—in fact Hedonism. Thus the *voluntas Dei* disappears; pleasure, higher or lower, takes its place as the great aim and object of mankind; and so, in a deep and tremendous sense, men are "lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God." The inevitable result of this deification of pleasure must be a fearful public degeneracy; a few philosophers may perchance content themselves with barren and arid mental delights, or with vain labours to construct model republics and Utopian communities. But what of the "swinish multitude," to use Burke's expression, of whom the Cyclops of Euripides is a type, who, in a sentiment quoted by St. Paul, declares, "I sacrifice to no one but myself, and my belly greatest of dæmons?" What will they become under the influence of the hedonistic religion, with its "agreeable sensation," "agreeable feeling" (i.e., that which *agrees* with human nature), and the like?

"Having an outward form of piety, but having denied its power." Destitute of godliness, these evil men are yet possessed of a kind of religion; whatever else perishes outward forms will remain, and on these, men from day to day are getting to lean more heavily. It is a very good thing to build and restore places of worship and to have orderly and harmonious services; but to regard such matters as the great feature in the religious life is simply to mistake the body for the soul, and those who do so should beware lest they come within the prophetic censure of the apostle. This "outward form" (*ωὸρ φωσιν*), in itself a necessity, has ever had an almost overwhelming attraction for the majority. The Greeks called Venus Aphrodite, their personified concept of love and beauty; Morpho, the shapely, the personified lust of the eye; but we look at the Unseen, and know that outward forms in the present dispensation are, at best, of infinitely secondary importance. So long as they are simple and decent, grave and reverend, it will suffice. Again, it may be noticed that a ritual of some kind, a religion, is a necessity of human nature. Those who will not worship God, by dread necessity are driven to worship the inferior. Some hasty travellers have reported the existence of savage tribes destitute of all religion and ritual; but more careful investigations have never failed to bring these features to light. Go, on the other hand, to those who would *improve* upon Christianity; they all declare the desirability and even necessity of having a religion. Take, for instance, Comte, the apostle of positivism; we find he "set no value on Protestantism in any shape. The religion of his own country he carried back to

Digitized by Google

mediæval forms, and then travestied it. There were many festivals, a calendar of saints, nine sacraments, and a horrible caricature of the Christian Trinity." (Rev. W. Jackson, F.S.A., *Positivism*, p. 133.)

Mr. Frederick Harrison has ready his religion of the future—the Religion of Humanity, which, I apprehend, is merely a kind of deification of fallen man.

These evil men are to have especial success upon, and influence over, the female mind, and it is mentioned that there are a class, and probably a very large class, apparently of considerable mental activity, with vague wishes to do some good thing, constantly inquiring, "Who will show us any good?" and, with the unhappy Pilate, "What is truth?" "ever learning and never able to arrive at the knowledge of truth;" a condition which is the inevitable fate of all, whether male or female, who reject the revelation of the one Lord Jesus Christ.

And, now, if these remarks come under the notice of any one who believes that the preaching of the Gospel as at present organised, and the efforts of Christians will result in the gradual improvement and in the ultimate conversion of the world to the faith, let him, with all earnestness, examine himself, and see whether he obtained this belief from the Word of God or from a tradition which makes void that Word. The present age will indeed close with a triumph of good, but this success will be due to no human efforts. It matters not what preachers and teachers may now tell us to the contrary: turn from them and listen to St. Paul and St. John.

These evil men of the last days had their especial prototypes in an age now deeply buried in the past. "In the same way as Iannes and Iambres opposed themselves to Moses, so shall these also oppose themselves to the truth, having been utterly corrupted in mind, reprobate (ἀδόκιμοι) concerning the faith." Observe, it is truth in the abstract that the "silly women" cannot attain; *the* truth, i.e., Christ and his Gospel, which is attacked by these "reprobates;" and this latter word is primarily applied to base metals that will not stand the purgation by fire, unproved, like Saul's armour; in contradistinction to those approved ones whose golden faith, fire-tried, shall be disclosed in all its splendour at the appearing of Jesus Christ. Of the former it may be truly said, "Reprobate silver shall men call them, because the Lord hath rejected them." The mention of two particular persons—Yannes and Yambres—is singular. These names were widely known; the Jerusalem Targum paraphrases Exod. vii. 11, "And Pharaoh called the wise men and the magicians; and Janis and Jambres the magicians of the Egyptians." Origen says that there was a book purporting to be written by them, and Eusebius (*Præparat. Evang.*, i. 9) quotes Numenius the Pythagorean philosopher that "Iannes and Iambres were Egyptian sacred scribes, inferior to none in magic arts, when the Jews were driven forth out of Egypt." Hillerus, cited by

Digitized by Google

Bengel, states that in the Abyssinian (Coptic ?) tongue, Iannes means "mocker," or "cheat," and Iambres, "juggler." These magicians of Egypt prefigure those who will work deceiving wonders at the end of the age (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10), but whose folly and infatuation will at length be glaringly manifested to the whole world.

After alluding to his own sufferings, and having added the memorable declaration that all who wish to lead a godly life must suffer, the apostle emphatically refers to the "sacred writings" as the grand antidote and preservative from error and ruin; they and they alone are able to make a man wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. They constitute the Magna Charta of the Church. In them the momentous events of the last days, as of the past days, are clearly revealed. He has told us before; he has declared his purpose by his servants the prophets; and the apostle most solemnly charges Timothy as the first of Christian duties to "proclaim the Word."

But the mind of the dying saint passes onward from his own personal troubles and impending martyrdom, down the long ages of the Christian dispensation, through the grievous times at its close, to the glory—the exceeding weight of glory—that shall follow. Jesus Christ shall judge his Church (2 Cor. v. 10), quick and dead, the sleepers in Jesus and the changed living saints, "about-the-time-of (κατὰ) his manifestation" in splendour and the establishment of his kingdom upon earth. All shall then have their rewards, their separated places in glory, differing as star from star; but all as vessels, whether of gold or of silver, made to honour in the great kosmic house of the Divine Father (2 Tim. ii. 20), shall be perfect and complete, lacking nothing. There is no doubt as to the safety, the eternal salvation, of each one of them; Paul shall have his crown, the conqueror's wreath (στέφανος); but so also shall every one who loves the Epiphany (τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν), the manifestation of the Master in glory, and, delivered from every evil work, shall be preserved unto the kingdom which is from heaven. The dark "last days" shall have a bright "last day." Four times—a pleroma of assurance—in one discourse does he, who is the resurrection, declare that he will raise each believer at "the last day" (John vi.); and though now we see him not, yet is he with us "all the days (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας) until the accomplishment of the age" (Matt. xxviii. 20), until the present dispensation, having played its part in the grand scheme of the eternal purpose, shall give way to another and a better.

ROBT. BROWN, JUN., F.S.A.

Digitized by Google

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE RATIONALE OF THE DOCTRINE.

PART III.

What is the Resurrection?

WE have thus—not we fear without sore trial of the reader's patience—reached the last stage in the elucidation of the theory of the resurrection we desire to propound; and it now only remains for us to speak of the consummation of the *Anastasis* in relation to the materialism of that new earth, with the announcement of which the prophetic vision of revelation is brought, provisionally at least, to a close. But before taking up this final branch of our subject, it may be well to refresh our memory by very briefly retracing the line of argument pursued up to the point at which we now stand.

We commenced our investigation, it will be remembered, by a careful and we trust candid review of the current theories of the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead. These we found were, speaking generally, reducible to *four*, which we denominated: (1) the *literal-identity* theory; (2) the *germ-survival* theory; (3) the *re-incarnation* theory; and (4) the *spiritual-body* theory. These diverse theories we in turn examined, and found ourselves compelled alike to reject in consequence of the insuperable difficulties, scientific, philosophical, critical, and theological to which they all appeared to be more or less exposed.

Proceeding then to the alternative view which we had to present, we, in the first place, laid down certain *conditions* to which, as it seems to us, any theory of the resurrection is bound to conform in order to be regarded as even speculatively true; and we here restate them, very briefly, for this among other reasons; that should any of our friends undertake the defence of some one of the theories above mentioned, or suggest another, we shall hold them bound by these conditions, unless they can at the same time show them to be either unsound or unreasonable. The conditions are these:—

I. It must be fairly in accordance with the teaching of Scripture on the subject *taken as a whole*, without unduly exaggerating the importance of some particular passage, peculiarity of expression, or mode of illustration.

II. It must not, by an obstinate adherence to the servile interpretation of Scripture language, contradict the well-established facts of science and experience.

III. It must not be based on some wholly gratuitous assumption, to which neither Scripture nor reason affords any adequate support.

IV. It must not fail to include the ultimate restoration of the material element in the complex unity of man's nature.

Digitized by Google

V. It must not involve the supposition of a solution of the continuity of man's being; as though he could be abolished out of God's universe for a time and yet have a renewed existence.

Entering next on the development of our theory, we drew attention to the fact that any scriptural conception of the resurrection must be essentially a Pauline one; Paul being, among the inspired writers, not only the one who has most largely treated of it, but also the only one, so far as we know, favoured with immediate and special revelations on the subject. Accordingly we took, as a starting point for our inquiry and the foundation stone, so to speak, of the theory we had to present, an important statement in his second Epistle to the Corinthians (chap. v. 1-9), from a critical examination of which we drew the conclusion that, according to the teaching of the apostle, the dissolution of the material organism,—our "earthly tent dwelling" as he graphically designates it,—will not leave us mere naked unembodied spirits, inasmuch as we shall find ourselves in immediate possession of a spiritual body, "a building from God, a house not made with hands, in the heavens, age-abiding." And we thereupon proceeded to show that, in point of fact, the supposition of some such spiritual corporeity was a philosophical necessity, apart from which the separate personal existence of a created and therefore finite spirit would be inconceivable. This harmonious testimony of Scripture and philosophy we furthermore pointed out, by a reference to that very able and valuable work *The Unseen Universe*, was in perfect accordance with the maturest conclusions of science. And in concluding this portion of our investigation we referred, without however at all building our argument upon them, to certain curious phenomena described by Mr. Gillingham and others, observed in the case of persons who have lost limbs by amputation or otherwise.

Resuming our subject, in the October number, we suggested the twofold inquiry, (1.) *When* does this spiritual body first come into existence? and (2.) *How* is it formed? In answer to the former of these questions we showed cause for concluding that the spiritual body, in a rudimental form at least, comes into existence *before the external materialism is cast off in death;* and, guided by the Apostle Paul's declaration in 2 Cor. v. 5, that God has given to believers "the Spirit *as an earnest" of resurrection*, we were led to find in REGENERATION, wherein the Spirit is bestowed, the true *terminus à quo* of the whole divine process of the Anastasis. We showed how clearly this was also the teaching of Paul in another of his great resurrection passages, Romans viii. 9-11, where if anywhere in the New Testament the rationale of the resurrection is revealed to us. In support of our conclusion we quoted some valuable remarks of Professor Perowne, to the effect that Christianity thus establishes our hopes of the future life, not only by pointing to an outward fact, i.e., the resurrection of Christ, but by the experience of an inward

Digitized by Google

fact, i.e., the communication of the life of the risen Saviour, in regeneration, to all who believe in him.*

Passing on then to the second inquiry, *How* does the spiritual body first come into existence, and what are the laws by which its growth and development are governed, and acknowledging the darkness and difficulty of this subject, we drew attention to the fact that science does at least seem to teach us that the substratum of all "matter" is "force" or motion, and the origin of all such motion *life*. Now since life can only manifest itself in the construction of its own appropriate organism, the character of the life, whether animal or spiritual, will determine the character of the organism; animal life developing an animal body, and spiritual life a spiritual body. Hence, as the soul in the natural man clothes itself earthwards in a gross and perishable material organism suited to the use and circumstances of the physical world, so does the quickened spirit, in the twice-born man, clothe itself heavenwards in an ethereal and imperishable organism which in its perfect development will be practically free of the universe. But it does this, as we observed, not immediately and of itself, at least in the case of man, but mediately through the soul in which the *form* or *ideal* of the body ever abides; nor yet *per saltum*, at some indefinitely remote period, but by an orderly growth, having its definite stages, and proceeding according to spiritual laws. Hence the *Anastasis* must be regarded not as an isolated and arbitrary act of divine power, but a continuous process, commencing in regeneration, carried on through and by means of the psychical body, and reaching its consummation only in the *egiro* of the last day.

In fine, we pointed out that from this theory of the resurrection two conclusions of great importance might fairly be deduced. In the first place, assuming the truth of the rationale of the formation of the spiritual body which we had suggested, namely, that the "quickening of the mortal body," of which Paul speaks in the eighth chapter of Romans, is taking place *here* and *now*; since day by day a transference, by the power of the quickened spirit, is being effected of the finer elements, or to speak more correctly, of the ultimate forces of the psychical to the spiritual body, even as in the seed the cotyledon is largely consumed in nourishing the germ: assuming the truth of this, we repeat, it enables us to establish, as no other theory yet propounded does, a causal † relation, and hence a fundamental identity, between our present and our future, our natural and our spiritual body; since it may truly be said that the one is being evolved even during the present life from the other. And secondly, inasmuch as, according to this theory, the development of the spiritual body depends absolutely upon the

* For a similar line of argument, admirably drawn out, we may refer to a paper on "The Two Adams" which appeared in the last issue of the RAINBOW.

† Not "casual" as printed in our last paper.—W. M.

Digitized by Google

power of the quickened spirit, it follows,—and how solemn and practical a thought is this!—that according as the action of the *pneuma* is weak or energetic, is aided or resisted by the *psyche*, will be the progress made in the development of the spiritual body, when, the material organism being dropped in death, it shall stand forth, as we believe it will stand forth, *the perfect objective embodiment of the spiritual and moral character we have formed on earth.*

Now if we were here to conclude our investigation, and present the theory thus unfolded as a complete rationale of the great doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, it would doubtless present a certain completeness, and might even claim to have indicated a more scientific and at the same time a scriptural ground of identity between the present and the resurrection body than can otherwise be maintained. Still we should have failed fairly to comply with the *fourth* of the conditions we had ourselves laid down, nor would it be easy to explain to the minds of readers in general wherein our theory differs from that of Swedenborg and the spiritualists.

Now it is impossible to read the New Testament—wherein alone any distinct revelation of the great truth of the resurrection is to be found,*—with candour and attention, without being convinced of these three things:—

(1.) Our Lord and his apostles do not identify the time of resurrection, in its final development and consummation at least, with the hour of death but with the day of judgment; "the last day," as our Lord himself calls it (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 50); the time of the sounding of the "last trumpet," as Paul defines it (1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16); the second personal coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 16; Rev. xx. 4, 5). Hence while the teaching of Paul in 2 Cor. v. 1-8, and Rom. viii. 9-11,—which we have endeavoured to develop,—cannot, assuming his inspiration, be contradicted, and must not be superseded by his teaching in 1 Cor. xv., it needs to be supplemented and completed thereby. The mistake of Christian eschatologists, we apprehend, has been to get their doctrine in the first place from 1 Cor. xv., and then force 2 Cor. v. 1-8, and Rom. viii. 9-11, and indeed all other passages, into conformity with it; whereas the more excellent way would have been that which we have adopted, namely, carefully and fearlessly to interpret the two latter passages and then supplement their teaching by the great argument of the former. A valid plea

* We hear much from some writers as to the absence of any teaching of the Old Testament regarding any future existence *out of* the body, but these writers overlook the fact, apparently, that the Old Testament is at least equally silent in reference to any future life *in* the body. If it knows nothing of "immortality," it knows just as little of "resurrection." The result of the most accurate and careful criticism points to the conclusion that the Old Testament "is time-bound, and stops, in so far as clear authoritative instruction is concerned, with this life."

Digitized by Google

for this mode of procedure may be found in the fact that while 2 Cor. v. speaks of the resurrection at the time and in connection with the dissolution of the mortal body; and Rom. viii. reveals more fully the divine principle on which the whole process of resurrection proceeds, before death, through death, and after death; 1 Cor. xv. gloriously unfolds the consummation thereof in relation to the advent of the Lord and the regeneration of the physical universe. Nor is any solid objection to our thus conducting the inquiry to be found in the fact that the inspired letters which contain the revelation of what we suppose to be the primary stages of this divine work are of earlier date than that which reveals the latter, since it is ever the manner of prophecy to indicate in the first place the fulness of the blessing, or the final result of the judgment, and afterwards to reveal more or less clearly the road and the stages by which the consummation will be attained.

(2.) Again, our Lord and his apostles invariably represent the resurrection of the saints, viewed in its consummation, as a corporate not an individual event. The harvest is ever the scriptural emblem of the resurrection. "The harvest," says our Lord in Matthew xiii., "is the end of the age, and the reapers are the angels; as therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the end of this age; the Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity. . . . Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Now not only is it here distinctly declared that "the harvest is the end of the age,"—not the day of the believer's death,—but no harvest we know is ever reaped in single ears as they ripen one by one, nor even in mighty sheaves, but by the whole wide field, or many fields at one and the same time. Hence, in like manner, the resurrection of "those that are Christ's" is ever associated with his coming, not providentially at death, but to this world for the establishment of his kingdom, and the creation of that "new heavens and new earth" wherein shall dwell only righteousness.

(3.) And once more, inasmuch as we are thus to look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, to "change the body of our humiliation that it may be fashioned like unto the body of his glory" (Phil. iii. 20, 21), we are warranted in regarding Christ's resurrection body as the true type and exemplar of ours. Now regarding the Saviour's resurrection body we know, from the Gospel narratives, that if not itself essentially material, it had at least the power of materialising itself at will. The women on their way from the sepulchre, we are told, held him by the feet (Matt. xxviii. 9); to the assembled disciples he said, "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have" (Luke xxiv. 39): and to Thomas, in particular, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side" (John xx. 27): though at the same time he could

Digitized by Google

pass through a closed door, appear and vanish in a moment, and rise up into the heavens contrary to the law of gravitation. Thus Christ's resurrection body, at all events while it remained within this earth sphere, had plainly a double character. It was essentially and fundamentally, as we believe, a spiritual body, nevertheless it could, as we have said, manifest itself materially at will. The doors of the physical and the spiritual worlds ever opened at the touch of him who had unlocked them once for all, and now for evermore wears their keys attached to his golden girdle. And it is on this supposition alone that we can satisfactorily meet the sceptical objection which is sometimes put to us,—*Where* was the risen Christ hidden during the forty days he is supposed to have remained on earth after he arose from the dead? How did he obtain food, and wherewithal was he clothed? The answer is, He was hidden in that spiritual world into which he rose, and out of which he descended as it pleased him. And as it was with the First-born, so shall it be with his many brethren; as it was with "Christ the firstfruits," so shall it be with "those that are Christ's at his coming." Their spiritual bodies shall be materially manifested to men still in the flesh, even as their Divine Master's was.

The beautiful theory of Lange and Nitzsch here finds at once its appropriate place and scriptural basis. We shall state it in the words of the former of these great theologians rather than in our own, both because he has unfolded it with admirable perspicuity, and because his statements will carry a weight with them which would not attach to any words of ours. "In the soul of man," observes Lange, "lies his personality. In his personality he is distinct from the Creator, he is a creature in the creation. In his soul man has the ability to assimilate to himself inferior elements, and to make them subserve his purposes. As a spiritual creature, he has a peculiar measure of powers and capacities, mingled in a peculiar manner, and therein lies the principle or essential element of his bodily formation. The figure, form, or appearance possessed by men, depends upon and has a causal connection with the spiritual powers which belong to them. The particular combination of the faculties in each individual imparts to him his appropriate individuality, even in its external manifestation. Thus the assumption of a corporeal form on the part of man, has its ground in his spiritual nature." In man as fallen, however, the spiritual element of his nature is subordinated to the physical; it is the soul rather than the spirit that governs the formation of his body. It is in his soul that he has the scheme or ideal figure of his bodily structure; and having closest affinity with earth, he accordingly assimilates to himself what he needs of earthly materials. Hence, as our great inspired authority expresses it, "The first man is of the earth earthy;" and "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." (1 Cor. xv. 47, 48.)

But this same law of organisation has also its higher realisation

Digitized by Google

in the spiritual region; and the spirit, asserting its supremacy in the regenerate man, assumes for itself, mediately through the soul, which must not be denied its legitimate place and being in our nature, a body *as* it is, from materials *where* it is. "We are, then, to contemplate the death of man, separately from its moral relations, as a laying aside of the earthly, or as a departure from the earth. When, however, a man leaves the earth, he does not leave the universe. As the earth has in itself matter which is simply earthy, while this same matter is pervaded by something of a higher sort, which belongs to the entire creation, (all space is presumably pervaded by the ether, which is the mysterious seed-bed of all vital energies,) and as, finally, the Divine existence pervades and fills the universe, so man also (the true microcosm), in accordance with the biblical representations of his entire nature, has the three simple characteristics—earthy, ethereal, spiritual; or something from God, something from the general substance of the universe, and something from the earth."

"Now, when man dies, he retains not only what he possessed as coming from God, a purely spiritual existence, but also what he has from the creation, an ethereal form and organisation, in other words a spiritual body; and he leaves only that which he had from the earth." Nevertheless the final restoration of the material element in the tripartite nature of man, in accordance with the scriptural representations to which we have above referred, is that without which the divine process of the *Anastasis* cannot be regarded as having reached its consummation. How and under what circumstances this is to be effected we may now proceed to indicate.

"If it is universally true that the spirit of the departed stays in the creation, then it will retain that which it had from the creation, and which it appropriated out of the existing materials of the creation in the way of a definite organisation by its own spiritual powers. This organisation is of the soul, and serves as a kind of inner robe for the spirit. But when it obtains its particular dwelling-place, then it will assimilate, from the materials of that place, what is suited to itself, and thus it will assume an organisation adapted to its sphere. How otherwise could a moving, acting, forming spirit remain in its sphere, and live in its entire activities, with its associates in the same sphere? A *perfect* nakedness of the spirit, would amount to its being in an absolute solitude, or in a state of such utter loneliness as we cannot think of. Even a *relative* nakedness—the unclothing of souls from their earthly organisation or covering, unfits them for that particular sphere. Hence we think of the departed as still existent, still near, but in another sphere. They are now unclothed and *relatively* naked, but not unclothed in the sense of being merely pure spiritual existences; they are not *absolutely* naked. They still possess and make use of what may be termed a body, or a corporeal substance. Accordingly the spirits

Digitized by Google

in hades must take their organisation from materials in hades; the spirits in heaven, from heavenly materials. The finer the material of their place of abode, the finer and more delicate will be the garment of their spirits; but there nowhere exist perfectly immaterial places or forms."*

It follows, then, that if there are many mansions in the Father's house, many realms of life, there must also be many kinds of bodies. One spirit may be clothed at the sun with the material of the sun; another at the moon, of the material of the moon; a third among the stars, of the materials of the stars. And so, in that classical passage respecting the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 39, *et seq.*, Paul first speaks of various kinds of *flesh*, "Not all flesh is the same flesh, but there is one flesh of men, another of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds." He then goes on to speak of various kinds of *bodies*, "There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another." Finally he speaks of the "heavenly bodies" as we call them, or the various spheres of life: "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory." Would Paul have given this entire exhibition, merely in order to show, by these accumulated analogies, that our resurrection-body will differ from our existing body? Does it not rather seem that in these analogies he is giving what may be termed the general law of organisation or embodiment? The assumption of a body by any creature depends, in the first place, on the inner principles of its being as a creature; hence the grand primary principle, "God giveth it a body according as he pleased, and to each kind of seed *a body of its own*." In the second place the character of its body will depend more or less on the stage of its development: "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body; *howbeit the spiritual is not first, but the natural, and afterward the spiritual.*" To which, finally, must be added the nature of its life-sphere, whether earth, or sun, or star; whether material or ethereal; each sphere of life having its own appropriate kind of body.

Man,—let us here be understood as speaking of renewed man,—passes at death, as we have seen, into hades, or in other words from the material into the ethereal life-region. The question then arises —and on its answer largely depends the settlement of that part of the theory of the resurrection with which we are now dealing—will the ultimate life-sphere—so far at least as the vision of revelation extends—be the material or the ethereal? In other words, Where are we to look for the future home of the redeemed? We have no hesitation in answering, with the whole testimony of Scripture before us,—to those "new heavens and NEW EARTH" to the creation of which both Testaments bear witness. (Isa. lxv. 17; 2 Pet.

* The Resurrection of the Body. (Biblical Cabinet, vol. xxxvii.)

Digitized by Google

iii. 13.) When, as Paul teaches, "the creation itself,"—mark! the same creation which was made subject to vanity,—"shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the sons of God" (Rom. viii. 19-23). When—and not till when—our Lord's promise shall receive its literal and plenary fulfilment: "Blessed are the meek; for *they shall inherit the earth*." (Matt. v. 5.) Now of this *new earth* Dr. Chalmers said long ago,—quite scripturally as it seems to us,—"There will be a firm earth, as we have at present, and a heaven stretched over it, as we have at present; and it is not by the absence of these, but by the absence of sin, that the abodes of immortality will be characterised. There will be both heavens and earth, it would appear, in the next great administration—and with this specialty to mark it from the present one, that it will be a heavens and an earth, 'wherein dwelleth righteousness.'"

This localisation of the future home of the risen saints within the sphere of the material will therefore, according to the universal law of organisation which we have indicated, necessarily involve the materialisation of their spiritual bodies when they are again brought within the region of the new but still material earth-sphere. Nor will this amount in any sense to a change of bodies, as though the spiritual body,—the "house not made with hands, in the heavens, age-abiding,"—could ever be laid aside and a new material organisation assumed. A tree bare and leafless in winter, does not cease to be identically the same tree, when at the breath of spring it clothes itself in its fair and living garniture of leaves and blossoms. Even in its winter sleep the tree possessed potentially this power of development, and if we suppose the existence of certain human beings here on earth, whose peculiarity of vision only enables them to perceive objects of a green colour, we can understand how the foliage of the tree might be to them the only evidence of its existence. So was it with our Lord's resurrection body, and so will it be with the resurrection bodies of his people. Christ's resurrection body was essentially a spiritual body, in which he could stand in the midst of his disciples unseen and undetected; but when he wished to manifest himself and hold intercourse with them, that spiritual body condensed and hardened into materialism, even as water hardens into ice. In other words he was able, as we shall be able, to pass at will from the ethereal to the material, and *vice versa;* for when we speak of the three great life-spheres of the universe,—the material, the ethereal, and the spiritual,—we must be understood as regarding them not as locally contiguous, but as pervading and interpenetrating each other.

It will doubtless be demanded, however, does Scripture anywhere recognise this distinction between the spiritual body of the *Anastasis* and its future materialisation? We answer, Yes; and that in a twofold manner. In the first place, the usage of the New Testament writers generally, and especially that of our chief authority on this

Digitized by Google

question of resurrection, Paul, marks a clear though not invariable distinction between the Greek words ἀνάστασις and ἐγείρω. Our translators evidently regarded the two words as mere synonyms, and as such commentators in general have considered them to this day, interpreting them as applying indiscriminately to the resurrection of the material body at the last day. When we look into the matter a little carefully, however, we discover that this is by no means the case; there is in truth a real and important difference between them. The word, *anastasis* means etymologically, simply a *rising up*, as opposed to a falling down; and that either from a state of repose to one of action, or *from a lower to a higher condition of existence*. Now in reference to the resurrection state, properly so called, we believe—though this is contrary to general conceptions on the subject—that the word has the latter application rather than the former. Fundamentally *the anastasis* is the rising up of the whole man, spirit, soul, and body, from a *psychical* to a *pneumatical* condition; though where reference is made to the dead, when we usually have the phrase ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, it denotes specially that stage in the Divine process which succeeds the dissolution of the mortal body, and thus it becomes equivalent to *future life*. After all that has been written on the passage, it is thus that the word must be understood in our Lord's argument with the Sadducees. (Luke xx. 20-40.) Indeed out of the forty times in which the word *anastasis* is used in the New Testament with reference to the dead, there are only six passages,—excluding John xi. 23, 24, which merely indicates current Jewish opinion,—in which it seems to refer either to the resurrection of our Lord *on the third day*, or to the resurrection of the saints *at his second coming*.

On the other hand the verb ἐγείρω, the primary meaning of which is to *awaken*, as from sleep, though used in reference to the dead no less than seventy-six times in the New Testament, denotes invariably either Christ's resurrection on the third day, or the resurrection of the saints at the last day; and cannot possibly be taken as equivalent to a future life as the immediate consequent of death. When the Christian dies he is said, in the language of the New Testament, to fall asleep. Not absolutely however, as though he lapsed into utter unconsciousness, or ceased to exist, but only *in relation to this world*, its phenomena, its interests, and its affairs. In death he falls asleep as far as this earthly life is concerned; he is withdrawn from the material sphere: but at the *egiro* he will re-enter it; he will awaken to its perception, its powers, and its activities. Thus the expressions to *fall asleep* and to *awaken* are seen to be correlative, and have alike a restricted reference to this physical world. But the Divine life—the process of the *anastasis*—is not arrested nor even interrupted by death, any more than a river, part of whose course is subterraneous, ceases to flow onward when it sinks into the sands, until it re-emerges with swifter current and in mightier stream many a mile away. The whole course of such

Digitized by Google

a river may answer to the *anastasis*, while its sudden reappearance will correspond with the *egiro:* in other words, *anastasis* as a noun may properly denote a state or condition, *egiro* as a verb rather denotes an act—a transition—a development—incident to that state.

Secondly, this distinction between the resurrection-state and the act of awakening within the earth-sphere, seems to be confirmed by Paul's mention, once and again, of the *manifestation* of the sons of God. Thus in Romans viii. 19, he represents the earnest expectation of the creation as "waiting for the *manifestation* of the sons of God;" and again, in Colossians iii. 4, he writes: "When Christ, who is our life shall be *manifested*, then shall ye also be *manifested* with him in glory." Mark then, Christ's resurrection took place more than eighteen centuries ago; but his *manifestation* is still an event of the future. And just so with the saints,—their *anastasis* —in a very real sense—takes place individually as one by one "their earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved;" but their *manifestation* can take place only collectively, when, in the language of Zechariah, "The Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." Now life must exist before it can be manifested, even as the sleeper must be alive or he can never be awakened. Both the awakening and the manifestation, it will be observed, are associated with the second advent of Christ; the events are synchronous; nay rather, the two expressions—awakening and manifestation—are descriptive of one and the same event, only viewed from opposite sides: the awakening is subjective, the manifestation is objective, —it is we *ourselves* who are awakened, it is to the *world* that we shall be manifested.

Glorious assurance! most blessed hope! Now year by year the loved ones are taken from us, they fall asleep, and to us the time of that last slumber is drawing nigh; but beside the grave of each sleeper faith sees as it were the angel of the resurrection sitting in expectant attitude, with far-off listening eyes, ready to raise the awakening trumpet to his lips. Now "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together," but its earnest expectation, its age-long cries and tears shall be sublimely answered, when, through the burst gates of hades, the vanguard of the armies of heaven shall be seen, as John saw them, in manifested glory; when the traditional saying of our Lord to Salome shall be fulfilled, "the outward shall be as the inward," and the kingdom of God shall have come.

Our theory of the resurrection is now complete, and we leave it to be judged by Scripture read in the light of reason. But something still remains to be said, as to the important doctrinal consequences which must follow its acceptance and the rejection of the literal-identity and germ-survival theories; and this may form the subject of yet another paper.

Florence Villa, North Finchley, N. W. MAUDE.

Digitized by Google

TEMPORAL DEATH NOT TOTAL EXTINCTION.

(*Concluded from page* 513.)

THE same principle of interpretation applies to 2 Sam. xii. 13 as to Hab. i. 12. "David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David, The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die." Mr. Mill says, "This cannot mean more than that David should not *then die*." But I can scarcely persuade myself that even he, in a calm reflective mood, would certify his conviction that David's deeds of guilt, whereby he twofoldly incurred the special penalty of death (see Lev. xx. 10; and Gen. ix. 5, 6), would be sufficiently punished and expiated by his troubled life on earth being shortened a few years. Is this all the wages that man's positive and rebellious sins now deserve? The Apostle Paul distinguishes clearly between the destruction of man's flesh and his total destruction. The flesh may be destroyed in order to the *saving* of the spirit. (1 Cor. v. 5.) That David was not adjudged to *then die* (a meaning doubtless included, and primary) we are sure would serve him as a pledge and earnest of the preservation of his soul and spirit unto life eternal; for the death of the soul would be with him the dread thing. This we think will be held by all who esteem that the Old Testament saints so lived "by faith, that they might obtain a better resurrection," awaiting their being "made perfect" with us.

That Mr. Mill "cannot see that any one passage of the whole group (including such expressions as, 'He hath not given me over unto death;' and, 'Thou hast delivered my soul from death') has the least bearing upon the question" of soul-survival, because as he conceives they do not reach in their regard beyond the temporal life of the body, we truly deplore.

Though it be true that only "God knoweth" what state Paul was in while receiving his "visions and revelations of the Lord," Mr. Mill overlooks the fact that *Paul knew* that it was in one or other of two states, viz., either "in the body, or out of the body." The like holds true of the prophet Ezekiel, when "brought in the visions of God into the land of Israel;" and of the seer John, when "borne away in spirit into a wilderness." In these several cases they were *themselves* respectively "caught up," "brought thither," and "borne away into." "The hand of the Lord was upon me," says Ezekiel, "and brought me thither." And as confessedly the apostle, prophet, and seer *may* on these occasions have been out of the body, this proves demonstrably the possibility of living existence in the case of man apart from the retention of his bodily organisms, and that in the active exercise of his perceptive faculties. Mr. Mill's speculation, therefore, suggesting the *possibility* of "a reason" why Paul should use such phraseology, and yet the above necessary inference not be available, is a matter which, in the honest quest of truth, we need not really concern ourselves with. Still we cannot forbear to remark upon the insufficiency of this imagined "reason." Because "the non-resurrectionists in Corinth" might have inferred from Paul's "being caught away into Paradise," that "it must have been only the soul" that was "thus caught away," the apostle, to make void their argument, told them that he did not himself know whether it were so or not. How this should confound their fancied faith, we are at a loss to conceive.

Digitized by Google

After it has been "frankly admitted that 2 Cor. v. 1-10 looks like countenancing the idea of life for man apart from the body," an ingenious attempt is made to represent the apostle as writing in perfect freedom from this idea. The "earthly house of tabernacle," whereof the apostle speaks, must be taken to mean the *earth*, as "the place of abode of our present mortal state, "surmounted by the heavens, which God spreadeth out as a tent in:" for St. Peter says that "all these things shall be dissolved," and he says, too, that "Paul in all his epistles spoke of *these things*," whilst St. Paul, in the passage before us, actually does speak of "our earthly house of this tabernacle" being "dissolved." Hence the irresistible conclusion, that St. Paul's "earthly house of tabernacle,"—and we presume the "tabernacle" too, that Peter was about shortly to put off, in earnest anticipation of which he wrote his epistle that his heavenly teaching might be had in remembrance after his decease—was the sky-canopied earth, doomed, according to the word of Peter, to be *dissolved*, melted, and burnt up! We cannot, however, "think it clear that 'our earthly house to be dissolved,'" identified as inclusive of the whole of "'the things seen and temporal,' spoken of by Paul, is the same as 'all these things that shall be dissolved,' of which Peter speaks." It is remarkable that this should so *clearly* appear to be the apostle's meaning, after its seeming "beyond question that the apostle here contrasts the present mortal body with the immortal body of resurrection." But what is the "building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens," which the apostle says, "we have" on the dissolution of "our earthly house of tabernacle?" This, we are instructed, is the "'new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness'—a dwelling place for the righteous."

This somewhat surprising conclusion is reached by a survey of "the materials which supplied the apostle with his imagery." To obtain reference to the "pattern of the tabernacle" we are carried back to the third chapter of the epistle, where no mention is made of it. But in Exod. xl. 19, "we find the apostle supplied with his varied 'mixture of metaphor.'" There we read how Moses "spread abroad the *tent over the Tabernacle*, and put the covering of the tent above upon it," Hence we learn that "the tabernacle proper" was housed in a "tent," which furthermore had a "covering above upon it," its "clothing, or vesture." Afterwards, when Solomon's temple was built in Israel's "place of 'settled abode,' . . . the tent house of the tabernacle, with its 'clothing,' was 'dissolved;' and the tabernacle (itself) taken into its more enduring 'building.'" This yields the apostle "an additional supply of metaphor." But we do not remember reading in Scripture of the tabernacle thus putting off its tent clothing, and then immediately putting on the temple. We had thought that the tabernacle was itself dissolved, and not merely its association with its tent-covering; and that it gave place to the temple, not that it was enclosed within it. And if we are right herein, our brother evidently "makes a mistake" in his "application" of the apostle's metaphors, and consequently "all (his) arguments and conclusions built upon that mistake must fall to the ground."

That the apostle, "a Hebrew of the Hebrews" as he was, had in his mind "the tabernacle of testimony in the wilderness," when he wrote of "our earthly house of tabernacle," we do not doubt. And not only

Digitized by Google

this, but the temple itself that succeeded it is appropriated in Scripture as a type of our present mortal body. "Know ye not," says the apostle (1 Cor. vi. 19), "that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you?" "Destroy this temple," said our Lord, to the Jews (John ii. 19, 21), "and in three days I will raise it up. He spoke of the temple of his body." St. John had previously recorded (chap. i. 14), "the Word became flesh and tabernacled among us;" this figurative expression conveying more the idea of transitoriness of duration than temple. Moreover, the ancient Job speaks (chap. iv. 19) "of them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust." And what does the apostle himself mean, in chap. iv. 7 of this 2nd epistle to the Corinthians, by the "earthen vessels" in which we now have "this treasure" "of the light of the knowledge of the glory of God" shining "in our hearts,"—what but our mortal material bodies? How can it then be said that "the language is wholly exceptional," if St. Paul figures physical death by "our earthly house of tabernacle being dissolved?" The parallel passages adduced suffice to show the harmony of Scripture on the idea of our present corporeal frame being regarded as a tabernacle or temple, and as such capable of dissolution, and destined thereto.

It seems over-refining to take exception to the apostle's words—"if our earthly house of tabernacle be dissolved"—as not fitly applying to the death of the body, because, "viewing man in his entirety as a tripartite being," he may be regarded as "dissolved" when there is a solution of the connection of his spirit, soul, and body, constituting the whole and perfect man: whereas, if by his figure the apostle intends the body, it is *it*, and not the complex man, that at death is conceived of as dissolved. Now, though we cannot allow that the body of itself is the man; so neither do we admit that it is so indifferently a part of him that he discards it "at death, as a man would cast off his coat, or leave a falling house." Nevertheless, though an integral part of man, the body, regarded alone, we hold to be properly subject to dissolution. For what is disease occurring in the living frame? Is it not dissolution already at work? And is it not that, when it has so far advanced as to disrupt the organism, whose interaction is needful for the maintenance of life in the body, then death ensues, and the man becomes physically defunct? Thus the dissolution of the body is going on before it ceases action, and vital force can no longer energise it. And death occurs at a crisis of the body's dissolution, when the soul is distenanted of its "earthly house of tabernacle." Therefore, this objection fails.

And what is there of force in the objection that the mortal body "will not contrast with the immortal, in its being 'not made with hands?'" The contrast we think is very distinct. The Psalmist (cxix. 73) says of God, "Thy hands made me and fashioned me:" and compare, for a fuller expression of this, Psa. cxxxix. 13-16. But the body of glory, with which the saints of God are to be invested, is not, that we are aware, anywhere represented as being the work of God's hands. On the other hand we read, as quoted for us. (Psa. cii. 25.) "Of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." And we also read: "Behold, I *create* new heavens and a new earth." (Isa. lxv. 17.) And "The new heavens and the new earth

Digitized by Google

which I will create" [revised version, "make"]. (Isa. lxvi. 22.) "Behold, I make all things new." (Rev. xxi. 5.)

If the contrast then, does not satisfy in the one case, does it appear even at all in the other?

It is somewhat curious and interesting to find that the working out of the counter interpretation of St. Paul's words to that which we think in sound reason must be adopted, leads to the same result as regards the fact of an intermediate state of living existence. That the "house not made with hands" is "the place of abode prepared for the glorified saints" there is such "ample corroborative evidence" as this:—God promised David that he would settle his seed in his "*house*" for ever. Accordingly, David was taken from the "sheep-cote," his earthly house of tabernacle, we suppose in figure; and in that transcendently beautiful psalm, the 23rd, he says, "I will dwell in the *house* of the Lord for ever." And what intervenes between the sheep-cote and the everlasting abode in the house of the Lord? David "expresses himself as 'fearing no evil,' though he 'should walk through the valley of the shadow of death,' and thus be concealed for a time in the tomb—'the land of darkness and shadow of death,—being confident that he would 'awake in his Lord's likeness.'" Thus David, while "concealed . . . in the tomb," is represented as "walking through the valley" of a "land of darkness," confident of "*awaking*" from his condition there. He can hardly, then, in his intermediate state be extinct. For an extinct man cannot truly be depicted, even in figure, as walking, reposing, and thence awaking.

We are told that "Paul clearly contemplates himself and the saints in Corinth" as in "three possible states or conditions." "In the second," the intermediate one of these states, in which, though not all yet confessedly some of the saints must "have part," the apostle contemplates them as "unclothed," "absent," "away from home;" yet not, it is said, "present with the Lord,"—which seems in almost precise contradiction, not only to the transparent teaching of this Scripture, but also to St. Paul's express desire, when writing to the Philippians to "depart and *be with Christ*." And, moreover, the "unclothed" man, an acknowledged condition in the case, is surely still a man, as likewise is an "absent" man, or a man "away from home."

But, if *the present earth* is the "home" in which the saints now dwell, "the body" wherewith they are now "clothed;" does it hold that when they physically die they become "absent" from this tabernacle-dwelling, become "unclothed" of this earthly "body?" Nay, on the theory that the man as made of dust is the true man, he then but the more clothes himself with this nature, he is the more closely sealed as a tenant of this clay. "Thou hast brought me into the dust of death," says the Psalmist (xxii. 15) in immediate apprehension of his decease. He is thus certainly *not* "absent" nor "unclothed," which is the intermediate condition that Paul is positively asserted evidently to contemplate. Again, if the "new heavens and the new earth," "the place of abode prepared for the glorified saints," be the "building of God," the immortal vesture, which the apostle earnestly desired to be clothed upon withal, how is it that it is described as "*in* the heavens," and "our house which is *from* heaven." And once

Digitized by Google

more : if the anti-typical tabernacle be the earth that now is, and the tent spread abroad over it, the present canopy of heaven; what, we pray, is the covering of the tent "put above upon *it?*"

We are invited to note "distinctly, that in this passage we have" presented two conditions of being "clothed," "present," and "at home;" between which there is a condition of being "unclothed," "naked," "absent," "away from home,"—the intermediate condition. And it is added, that "Paul evidently contemplated it as possible that, long before 'our earthly house of tabernacle was dissolved' . . . he might be 'unclothed,' 'absent.'" But not a tittle of *evidence* of this do we discern on a reading of the passage; whilst we note that from the above description omission is made of the important and decisive explanatory epithet of "the body." The apostle himself says, "whilst we are at home *in the body* we are absent from the Lord," and "we are . . . willing to be absent *from the body*, and to be at home with the Lord," striving that "whether at home or absent we may be well-pleasing unto him." Now, is our "place of abode in our present mortal state," the "heavens and earth that now are," ever spoken of as the human "body?" For there clearly should be this virtual identification to justify the interpretation of this passage now proposed to our acceptance.

We cannot imagine that Peter was thinking of "putting off" the present earth and heaven, when he contemplated "speedily putting off this my tabernacle." Paul's striving that whether "absent" he might be "well-pleasing" unto the Lord, may present an aspect of the ridiculous, and appear "curious" to some minds. Nevertheless, they are inspired words, and we accept them as sound speech, not to be condemned.

We are fully persuaded that a candid intelligent perusal of the whole passage of St. Paul (2 Cor. iv. 7, to v. 10) will convince any reader that "the earthen vessels," "the body," "the mortal flesh," "the outward man" which is in relation with "the things that are seen" and that "are temporal," "our earthly house of tabernacle" to be "dissolved," and in which "we groan" and are "burdened,"—but divested of which we are "naked," "unclothed,"—"the body" in which when "at home" "we are absent from the Lord," and in which we walk by faith," from which also St. Paul was "willing to be absent" that he might "be at home with the Lord," and "at home" in which or "absent" from which he earnestly strove that he might "be well pleasing unto him;" "for according to what" every one "hath done in" this "body" shall he receive when "made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ;"—that these all unequivocally refer to one and the same thing, our present frail tenement of clay, the temporary abode of our soul and spirit; to give place to a nobler clothing, to a better building, weighted with, and whelmed in glory, not yet seen, eternal, from God, from heaven, that will swallow up mortality by life.

It has been no part of our purpose to ascertain or to defend the "popular idea" respecting the abode and condition of the soul of man after the death of his body. But, for all that Mr. Mill has written of attempted disproof, we are the more fully and firmly convinced that our original thesis, based on the immediate teaching of Scripture, is sound and true, and that the physical death of man extends not to the extinction of the entire of his life, but only of his body's life.

G. A. HAYWARD.

Digitized by Google

REV. C. CLEMANCE ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.*

MR. CLEMANCE'S little book on "Future Punishment" is not likely to satisfy any minds except those which are of intellectual structure similar to his own; it has not much claim to criticism or reflection in any part; and it is disfigured by a certain degree of temper against those whom he terms "annihilationists," which can be excused in so good a man only by his painful experiences with the Nottingham Christadelphians.

The book opens with the statement that "the question of the duration of future punishment ought not to be dealt with at all until the mind is informed on the teachings of revelation as to the economy of the Divine administration, the vastness of mediatorial sway, the *reason* of punishment, the ground of it, and the contents of it. Then we may inquire, How long will it last? but till then such inquiry should be delayed. To do otherwise is out of harmony with both reason and Scripture." (P. 12.) If this means that the question of future punishment ought to be studied as a part of the whole system of God's dealings with man under love and under grace, we cordially agree with the author. But then this is precisely what we cannot generally prevail on men of Mr. Clemance's turn of mind to do. Numerous writers have set forth arguments on the nature of man, the scope of his trial in Paradise, the nature of the threatening held out to disobedience, the effect of the fall, the object of redemption—with many collateral topics thereunto belonging; but it seems impossible to persuade most of our opponents even to notice that general system of doctrine, much less directly to meet the interpretation on which it rests. Men go on nibbling month after month, year after year, at this text and the other on future punishment; but they will not face the complex argument on the death brought in by sin, and the life bestowed by Christ in the regeneration of mankind. Surely this persistent silence on and summary contempt for the whole theological system elicited by the doctrine of life in Christ, is "out of harmony with both reason and Scripture."

Mr. Clemance, who restricts his observations nearly altogether to one topic, offers on p. 15, a view of the four possible schemes of doctrine on future punishment: 1. The theory of Universalism; 2. The theory of Annihilationism; 3. The theory of Endless Misery; and 4. The theory of Unrevealed Possibilities.

Mr. C. dismisses the first as destitute of all sufficient scriptural authority; but he might have made out a far stronger indictment on this head than he has made, if he had been so disposed. Meantime he treats Mr. Jukes, and the upholders of this utterly unscriptural tenet, with the greatest kindness and consideration. He then proceeds to the second heresy, that of "annihilationism"—and for this and its adherents he has not a good word to say. He treats the maintainers of the doctrine of Life in Christ to a marvellous exhibition of contemptuous dogmatism, and to no small measure of positive misrepresentation. Let us take some specimens in order. He quotes words as from my own book (in the middle of the most important argument of his own), which are

* J. Snow, Ivy Lane, 1877.

Digitized by Google

nowhere to be found in it, and suppresses a clause which shows that the sense he puts on the remainder was not designed by the writer; but this was probably an oversight, and therefore shall not count.

1. He gives as the first article of our faith that "Man has no other than a highly organised and endowed animal nature, differing not in kind, but in degree from that of the brute creation, and equally liable with them to perish." It is really lamentable to find a pious man supposing that he can further the ends of truth by such misstatements as these; but after Mr. Baldwin Brown's example we may be the less surprised at the conduct of any other commentator. Let Mr. Dale's answer serve for a reply to this hideous misconception of our meaning:—"The tree of life was no graceful ornament of the paradise of God; it was there because man needed it; it is the immortal symbol of the truth that there are wants in human nature which only a Divine life can satisfy, possibilities which only a Divine life can fulfil. A beast! No! Man is infinitely more than that. It is not a beast who struggles vainly against destiny in the ancient tragedy. It is not a beast that in modern times resents with infinite sorrow and fierce revolt the pain and disorder which have come on this creation. It is not a beast that has sought for gods to worship in the stars of heaven, and in the meanest and most majestic objects on earth, in the clouds, in the winds, and in the heroic founders of national communities. It is not to a beast that the moral law appeals. It is not to a beast that the life of God can be given. It is not a beast that has the power to refuse it." After this, I hope we shall hear no more of Mr. Clemance's unbefitting accusations. The greatness of man is implied in the very words of the awful curse on abandoned sinners: "These, as natural, irrational creatures, made for capture and extinction, speak evil of the things they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption (2 Peter ii. 12)."

2. Mr. Clemance will find when he can forget his former Christadelphian adversaries at Nottingham, and attend more closely to a different class of maintainers of the doctrine of Eternal Life in Christ, that these do not look upon the life which Adam lost as simply *being*, much less as merely animal being, but a life in God's image; and an eternal life, because Divine. And he will further find that they think the life restored in redemption, and commenced in regeneration, to be something more than an eternal being, or an eternal physical being. It is life in God's holy image, and again, an eternal life, because Divine. Mr. Clemance's friendly endeavours, therefore, to teach us that man is something more than an animal, may for the future be expended on those who need such instruction, and we do not deny that there are such (pp. 24-32).

3. Mr. Clemance next delivers a lecture to annihilationists on their "wretched handling of the Book of God," taking no notice of the difference in the date or the authorship of the varied books of Scripture. "Chapters written in an early age for infant minds are dealt with as if they were written in precise formulæ: and the first chapters of Genesis are referred to as if they contained a scientific statement of the constitution of man. Had they done so they would have failed of their end for centuries after they were written. We cannot consistently, in the same breath, maintain that the word of God (especially in its earliest stages) is written in a style not scientific but popular, and then appeal to its rudi-

Digitized by Google

mentary chapters as if they were not popular but scientific. Neither should the Book of Job, the Psalms, and the Prophets be all heaped together without any questions being asked respecting any statement, Who said it? and when was it said? We can never afford to forget the progressiveness of revelation, and unless we distinguish the date and the author of any words which may be adduced in proof of this position or that, we may make the veriest jumble of the Book of God" (p. 34).

Amidst these reflections on the illiterate character of our "annihilationists" Mr. Clemance forgets several things. The undersigned scribbler, for one, scarcely ever refers to an Old Testament writer without referring to his date. Secondly, Mr. C. forgets the most remarkable element of the case for consideration, viz., that the Bible writers of all ages, whether of the Old Testament or the New, whether popular or scientific, use precisely the *same terms* to denote the punishment of sin, death, and destruction, and precisely the same term to denote the destiny of God's servants, namely,—"living for ever," or "for ever and ever." The popular and the scientific are not at variance, but exactly coincide. And it is for Mr. Clemance to tell us how it is that if the object was to teach man's immortality under every contingency of his conduct, language was chosen which, taken in its obvious sense, is directly contrary to that hypothesis.

4. Mr. Clemance gives us some criticisms on the meaning of *apollumi*, and implies that there is no foundation for thinking the proper and normal meaning of this word is to destroy. In such a matter as this we can only fall back on the testimony of men whose profession it is to understand Greek. Dr. Weymouth, for example, says, "My mind fails to conceive a grosser misinterpretation of language, than when the five or six strongest words which the Greek tongue possesses signifying destroy, or destruction, are explained to mean maintaining an everlasting but wretched existence. To translate *black* as *white* is nothing to this."

5. We now come to Mr. Clemance's notice of the doctrine of the absolute endlessness of sin and suffering. He tells us that there is "incomparably more of Scripture in this direction than in that of Universal Restoration, or in that of Annihilation." He says that "both of these theories are meant as refuges from the doctrine of endless punishment," but that he does not wonder at many seeking a refuge from it, especially since so many of its advocates have rendered it too horrible to be heard. He rejects Moses Stuart's dictum that the endless happiness of the righteous must stand on the same foundation of criticism as the endless misery of the wicked, and even as the endless glory of the Godhead. He then gives a careful table of the Scripture uses of *aion* and *aionios*: bringing out the result that both the noun and the adjective are used to signify, 1. That which is certainly infinite in duration. 2. Time indefinite in the past. 3. Time indefinite in the future. 4. Time bounded by well known conditions. 5. Time unbounded so far as Divine Revelation goes, but which we have come to know has had its bounds. 6. Time unbounded so far as Divine Revelation goes, and to which, if there be a bound, it is still a secret in the mind of God. Under the last head he places Matt. xxv. 46. He then concludes thus: "If an æon of the present may end, if æons in the past have actually ended, and if

Digitized by Google

æon may follow on æon, then plainly an æon is not necessarily or always infinite. But if so, then æons on æons may have an end, and there may be, *for aught we can tell*, all the difference of an eternity between the duration indicated by 'æons on æons' and absolute endlessness." "All depends on the object to which the adjective or noun refers." "If we go beyond Scripture and deal with it as if its disclosures were absolute instead of relative, we shall put a strong temptation in men's way to seek a refuge from the doctrine of endless punishment in that of annihilation, or in that of restoration. Better, far better to say, God does not reveal a limit to future punishment." "Any other view seems to us to do terrible violence to the word of God. For these reasons we feel compelled to abstain from an assertion of the absolute unendingness of future punishment: especially when the fact is that there is no statement, either in Old or New Testament, which refers to evil that is so strongly worded in its expression of duration as is the phrase in Eph. iii. 21, which refers to the glory of God. 'Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus unto all the generations of the age of the ages.'" "We can confidently affirm that the saved will live on through all the ages, and yet feel it our duty, on exegetical grounds, to be *entirely* silent as to the actual duration of evil—save as we say of it—God has not shown us the end."—Pp. 60-64.

6. Mr. Clemance then brings forward his own, the fourth, theory of future punishment, which is, that language is used respecting its duration which *may* mean endlessness, but which may *not*. "We do not affirm there is no limit, we do affirm that there is no revealed limit." "This is the only doctrine on this subject that we dare to teach. We can teach this because it is something more than a theory."—P. 67.

Mr. Clemance's theory therefore is indefiniteness rather than endlessness. He says "the unbeliever had no *real* argument before. He will not have the semblance of one now."

Now we frankly confess that the condition of Mr. Clemance's mind on this subject is to us inscrutably mysterious. He tells us that "if we assert the absolute unendingness of punishment, we may *cause a fatal revolt against Christianity*, which fatal revolt will be less the fault of the unbeliever than ours. We impose *a weight on him which no human intellect can bear*," (the italics are those of Mr. Clemance,) "and make a fearfully rash assertion." Nearly the last sentence of the work is this:—"The absolute eternity of evil is nowhere affirmed."

We submit to Mr. Clemance a very few reflections on his statements.

1. First of all, he must concede that, until his book taught us the true theory of the indefiniteness of the Scripture language of duration in respect to evil, there was more than a good excuse for our errors, for our "fatal revolt:" there was an inevitable defence of it; because, what we had been taught is, as he knows, the "absolute unendingness of evil," and that "*imposes on us a weight which no human intellect can bear.*" Mr. Clemance therefore ought to have used much milder language towards us. We had been educated under a false theory, imposing a weight which no human intellect could bear; and our revolt into the notion that perhaps the Scripture language on *loss* and *destruction* is to be taken in its most obvious sense, was one of the most pardonable events in human history. If, as he admits, our minds and

Digitized by Google

intellects would have given way, and we should have become lunatic or infidel, unless we found means of relief, he scarcely ought to reprove us so sharply for "distorting Scripture." A man who is bred under a system which is driving him mad, should be dealt with patiently if he makes some effort to retain his senses and his faith at the same time. Meantime, we commend to the notice of the public Mr. Clemance's declaration, that *the human intellect cannot bear up under the weight of the accepted doctrine of absolutely endless misery.*

2. We submit to Mr. Clemance that the relief which he offers is of a very inefficacious quality. He allows that the assertion of an absolute infinity of duration, as required by the terms *aion* and *aionios*, will break down our intellect; but all the relief he proposes is to allow us to think that *perhaps* these words may be taken in the sense of endlessness, perhaps not. Does Mr. Clemance really think that this will do much for the "consolation of Israel," or for the conviction "of unbelievers?" No one but a practised metaphysician can succeed in balancing his mind for any length of time in an attitude of sceptical or believing equilibrium. The theory will not *work* in common minds. They will say naturally; "If the popular belief is not based on sound criticism, if the absolute eternity of evil is nowhere affirmed; we shall decide on the favourable side of the doubt, and firmly conclude that the suffering of the wicked will end; that *aionios* must be understood in its limited sense; and if it is to 'distort' Scripture to say that *destruction* means destruction, why we shall all turn Universalists." This will be irresistibly the practical effect of Mr. Clemance's hypothesis, so far as it exerts any influence at all. So far as men may be inclined, by the authority of Mr. Clemance, on the other hand, to think, or to fear, that the unlimited sense of the words is the right one, they will fall under the sway of a doctrine which (we have Mr. Clemance's testimony to it) will "break down their intellect," and endanger a "revolt" against Christianity altogether.

3. But we have another and final objection to our friend's "view which is something more than a theory." His air of superior scholarship and wisdom becomes almost entertaining when he is engaged in putting down the "annihilationists." He writes as if they all were a set of school-boys who are scarcely worthy of the expense of pen and ink to convert them. But after the admissions just reprinted from Mr. Clemance's own pages, it is in a much more serious tone that we shall reprove his language. "The Annihilation theory *distorts* Scripture." Is it then to distort Scripture to take its words in their proper sense? Is it to distort Scripture to abstain, as Scripture does always, from speaking of the "immortality of the soul?" Is it to distort Scripture to take the main current of its expressions on the future destinies of men in the sense which these words bear on all other subjects in the Bible, and in all other literature? No, this is the last charge which should be brought against the doctrine of Life in Christ only. Does Mr. Clemance think it decent for a gentleman of his attainments to speak of men some of them, like Professor Hudson, Mr. Dale, Professor Stokes, F.R.S., and twenty others, at least his equals in scholarship and ability, as if they deserved to have their ears boxed for wilful perversion, just because they take the Scripture testimony on the object of the Incarnation in the

Digitized by Google

sense that Irenæus took it, only one remove from the Apostle John? But enough of such questions. During the last few years many books on this subject have appeared, but we know of none more deserving of criticism than this insufficent performance of Mr. Clemance.

EDWARD WHITE.

TYPICAL AND ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATIONS.

THAT "the law," with its priests and rites, foreshadowed "better things to come," is plainly taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews. (See chaps. ix. 1-9, 23; x. 1; compare also Col. ii. 17; Gal. iii. 24; iv. 21-31.) But as we have not the various institutions of the law placed side by side with their several antitypes, or particularly expounded in the apostolic writings, it seems hazardous for any one in these latter days to specify the signification of these institutions farther than we find done in the New Testament writings.

In reading the Scriptures we should also be careful to distinguish between simple analogies, resemblances, or illustrations, and what is strictly *typical* in the sense of actual prophecies of things to come. For instance, our Lord illustrates his burial and resurrection by an event in the history of Jonah (Matt. xii. 40); and the object of his death on the cross, with the lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness (John iii. 14). Again, the priesthood of Messiah is said to be "after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. vii.); and the salvation of Noah and his family, by means of the ark, is affirmed by the Apostle Peter to have its antitype in baptism, which now "saves us (not by the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but by the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. iii. 20.) These events illustrate later truth; but there is nothing to show that either the persons or events referred to were *designed*, originally, to be prophetical figures of coming persons or events.

A question here, naturally, presents itself—viz., How are we to know, with certainty, what persons and events, mentioned in the Old Testament Scriptures, were *intended as representations* of other persons and events recorded in the New Testament writings? In reply to this important question, we take the following extract from the writings of Bishop Marsh, as safe and sound counsel:—"There is no other rule by which we can distinguish a real from a pretended type than that of Scripture itself. There are no other possible means by which we can know that a previous design, and a preordained connection existed. Whatever persons or things, therefore, recorded in the Old Testament were expressly declared by Christ and his apostles to have been designed as prefigurations of things relating to the New Testament, such persons and things, so recorded in the former, are types of the persons or things with which they are compared in the latter. But if we assert that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing, where no such prefiguration has been declared by divine authority, we make an assertion for which we neither have nor can have the slightest foundation."

Digitized by Google

To the same effect writes Moses Stuart:—"Just so much of the Old Testament is to be accounted typical as the New Testament affirms to be so, and no more." By this rule we shall be saved from the illusions and conceits of expositors whose fancy holds the reigns of their judgment; and the unlearned reader shall be able to decide for himself, as to what is typical and what is not."

Had these principles been adhered to, the earnest student of the Bible would have been saved from the bewilderment to which the fanciful and misleading interpretations of some writers have subjected him. Thus—one avers that Moses typifies Christ in "forty particulars;" another, that "every passage in the Old Testament looks backward and forward and every way, like light from the sun;" and a third, that "there are forty-nine typical resemblances between Joseph and Christ, and seventeen between Jacob and Christ—his worst actions being regarded equally symbolical with the best."*

The reader may have met with similar examples. Such interpretations are based on the assumption that the words of God conceal his meaning, and that the meaning of the language of the Bible is to be discovered by human ingenuity; that beneath the obvious statements of Scripture lie deeper meanings, which are only to be discovered by "the spiritually minded," a quality which these interpreters suppose themselves to possess—mistaking fancy for insight. In this way, the revelation of God's will and purposes to men, is treated as if it were an enigma, in the solution of which it has been truly though severely said—"We may shut our lexicons, and draw lots for the sense."

To read the Scriptures with accuracy and profit we must be content to regard as typical and allegorical so much of them as is declared to be so on inspired authority, believing that we have before us the will and purposes of God made known for our faith and obedience, in words and figures intended to be understood in their ordinary acception, and in accordance with the obvious sense of the context. W. Laing.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"EXPELLED IN LOVE."

Dear Sir,—Feeling assured that most of your readers will be interested in the progress of the truth in this part of the world, I submit, with a short preface, the account of the trial and expulsion of a ministerial member of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Madras. I do this with the full concurrence of the brother expelled.

Charles R. Jeffries was converted to God in Calcutta in 1873 under Evangelist Taylor's preaching. Feeling called to the work he joined the ministerial ranks and was ordained deacon by Bishop Harris, of the Methodist Episcopal Church in January, 1874, and withdrew from that office in October of the same year. After working in different stations in Bengal he was shifted to Bangalore and then to Bellary, in the Madras Presidency, to

* Interpreter, vol. ii. 230.

Digitized by Google

fill a vacancy as pastor to a young and healthy church. It was here I met him, and had the joy of knowing that he was impressed with the truth of life only in Christ. Although he never taught it, yet, the fact getting wind, it was not long before he began to be coldly treated by his brethren in the ministry. For some reason he was shifted to Madras City, the head quarters of the Conference. Here he was led to resign his ministerial office. He worked as a local preacher until June, 1877. I here quote his own words. "I asked Bro. Hard (Presiding Elder) to accept my resignation as a local preacher, not choosing to give my reasons. Bro. Hard said he would not do so. He begged of me to remain in the church as a local preacher as they were short handed. I told him that my mind was made up, and I wrote him two days after a formal resignation of my office. . . . On the following Sunday morning I saw Bro. Hard at the Sunday-school; he asked me to review the quarter's lessons with one of the classes, and asked me to be present at the 11 a.m. service, and so take part in the preliminary exercises. I promised to be there. After Sunday-school I went over to his house before his return. Shortly after Bro. Hard and Bro. G. (solicitor) returned from another school, we were not seated five minutes, when Hard said, 'Bro. Jeffries, I cannot accept your resignation, as a charge is brought against you, and you are to be tried to-morrow at 6 a.m., and if convicted to be expelled.' 'Charge,' I said, 'what charge?' 'Holding different views on doctrinal subjects.' 'Oh,' I said, 'I am quite ready for the trial, and will make my defence then.' 'Mind you,' he said, 'there will be no discussion allowed.' (How terribly frightened they are to let us open our lips!) . . . I was at Bro. Hard's house on Monday, 25th June, at 6 a.m. There were present, ordained ministers, Hard and Shaw; laymen, Gordon, O'Hara, Reardon, and Jackson. Bro. Hard presided and Reardon was nominated as Secretary. Bros. Shaw and Gordon had not arrived in time, so Hard read out several passages from Methodist theological works, Watson, Wesley, Binney, Adam Clarke, &c., to show that although eternal torment was not explicitly mentioned in the discipline as one of the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, yet it was to be inferred as such from these writers. I need not tell you that some of the passages he read spoke distinctly of eternal punishment, not 'torment;' and, since the trial, I have found out that Watson in his Institutes, vol. i., pp. 22, 82, and 83, speaks of the doctrine of natural immortality as a presumption contradicted by the Scriptures, which speak of it as a gift from God. I also find that Binney did not hold the doctrine of eternal torment. Well, to proceed with the trial. All had assembled—no prayer offered. Hard asked Shaw to say what he had to say against me. Shaw said he only knew that I had written to you about a sermon he preached lately, and said it was an attack on those holding the doctrine of eternal death literally. Gordon chimed in and said that I had been writing about a Methodist pastor, and intimating that it was defamatory. I was then asked if I admitted the charge or not? I replied, What is the charge brought against me, and by what rule or clause of the discipline am I being tried, and who is my accuser? Gordon said I had nothing to do with all that. Would I admit having written to Bro. Winckler about

Digitized by Google

Bro. Shaw's sermon or not? Yes or no. I replied that he, as a solicitor, ought to know that any one accused and brought to trial ought to know the charge brought against him, and his accuser. Bro. Hard said that I was being tried under clause 222, p. 140, of the discipline, which reads, "Any member who is charged with endeavouring to sow dissension in any of our societies, by inveighing against either our doctrines or discipline, the person so offending shall first be reproved by the preacher in charge, and if he persist in such pernicious practices he shall be brought to trial, and if found guilty, expelled." I said that, according to the above clause, I did not admit the charge; that although I have been studying and getting light on the subject of immortality for some months back, yet I had been sowing no dissension. I never brought it forward except when I could not help it, &c. I said that Bro. Hard and several others had seen me time and again with books on this subject, and had never raised an objection. I stated again my views and belief clearly, and said that I knew they were opposed to the popular belief. I was asked why I did not act honourably and give up my license as local preacher, when I was holding opposed views on doctrinal subjects. The case of Rev. Williams, of the Wesleyan Mission, Bangalore, who has lately seen the truth, and had returned his parchments, was quoted as an example of how I should have acted. I said that I did not think the Church had any right to deprive a member of the privilege and right of private interpretation. If I saw anything in a different light, and thought that the Church was in error, it is my duty to try and point out the mistake, but not to leave it. Well, for a long time there was a discussion as to whether I could be charged as a local preacher when I sent in my resignation; and whether I could be tried by the said clause. On the first point they decided to accept my resignation, and proceeded immediately to try me as a member. Bro. Hard then instructed the committee on the meaning of the clause. He said he understood by it that writing about it to any one holding this view, reading books, and conversing with members was included or implied by the expression, 'sowing dissension.' . . . The committee, after conference, was asked to return their verdict, which was that the charge was sustained, and I should be expelled in love. While in the meantime the secretary was preparing the records, Bro. Hard was reading out a pamphlet on 'Materialism Refuted,' and would not allow me to say a word. Well, I am right glad that the Lord has brought me out of worse than Egyptian bondage. The Church is sending out a circular asking those members who believe our views to sign their own death warrant, so to speak."

I have tried to condense this lengthy letter as much as possible. Here ends the connection of one awakened and brought from a life of utter carelessness to the knowledge of the Lord Jesus, by a Church the most evangelical and large minded, and yet, four years after, this same Church expels him for rejecting a doctrine the most monstrous and outrageous that ever reflected on the character of Him who is Love. Yours sincerely,

G. W. WINCKLER,
Preacher of the Gospel, and
member of the M. E. Church.

Chittledroog, India.

P.S.—I have just received my own notice of trial. More to follow.

Digitized by Google

CONSCIOUSNESS AFTER DEATH.

DEAR SIR,—I trust you will allow me to say a few words in reply to Mr. M. M. Wilson's letters. In his first he refers to my argument on 2 Cor. v. 1-8 and 2 Pet. i. 14. I cannot see how his purpose is served by adopting Robert Young's translation of 2 Pet. i. 14, and still maintain that St. Peter's speaking of the putting off, or laying aside, of his tabernacle in the death predicted to him by his Lord, does "convey the idea of the soul (or spirit) putting off the body," which clearly is the tabernacle Peter speaks of, "and living without it." As Dean Alford says, and as any one may see, "the two figures of a tabernacle or tent and a garment, are intermingled, as in 2 Cor. v. 1, &c.; and the figurative language as clearly implies an unclothed body and an unhoused tenant; which body and tenant are evidently the disembodied soul or spirit."

As regards 2 Cor. v. 1-8, Mr. Wilson seems to me wrong in saying that the "earthly house of this tabernacle" "refers to the entire man in his earthly state." For Paul "speaks of something he called himself—I or we—as being now in the tabernacle dwelling or clothing of the mortal body; of being unclothed of it for a time; and being at a future time, that has not come yet, clothed upon with his house from heaven and no longer naked." These are my words quoted from the RAINBOW, p. 427, and they not only prove, as I think, the preceding point, but also show that I do not hold that "immediately after death we have a 'building eternal in the heavens.'" We have it there even now, indeed, according to St. Paul's language of strong faith and hope—"reserved in heaven for us,"—but not to be given to or put on by us till the resurrection.

I do not consider "to be away from the house of the body" at all a fair rendering of *ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος*. "To migrate out of the body"—Dean Alford's rendering—is perfectly literal, not that I think it at all preferable to that of the authorised version. But it clearly does not admit of Mr. Wilson's idea of "the body" there meaning the Church. Saints are not excommunicated at death. Paul was certainly not turned out of the Church, which is Christ's body, when he died. The only body he then vacated was the worn out clothing of his earthly pilgrimage tent, i.e., his mortal body.

When "the body," in 2 Cor. v. 8, is taken by an opponent in this controversy to be the Church or anything but the mortal body, I am, controversially speaking, satisfied. The *reductio ad absurdum* of his argument is then, to my mind, complete. I am glad to see, however, that Mr. W. is not quite content with his interpretation, and considers that "possibly St. Paul means" something else, in which, so far as the words, "to be absent from our earthly bodies," I quite agree with him. As to St. Paul's not "taking any account of the unconscious interval," between death and resurrection, I answer in the strong words of Mr. J. Mill (p. 360 of the August RAINBOW), "Had Paul not contemplated an interval of some duration in the 'unclothed' state, but an instantaneous change from the 'earthly' to the 'heavenly,' how could he, by any possibility, have expressed an aversion to be 'unclothed' and at the same time 'an earnest desire to be clothed upon?'"

I really do not know any pas-

Digitized by Google

sage of Scripture "which by the separate conscious existence of the soul would be reduced to absurdity."

I come now to Mr. Wilson's second letter. My answer to it may be very brief. He says that I argue "that a continued conscious existence of the soul between death and resurrection is necessary for proper identity" "in the resurrection." But if he looks at the first paragraph of my letter, p. 91 of the February RAINBOW, he will see that I make a distinction between the two very different theories of the "unconscious state" and "the nonentity of the dead." And in all my argument with Mr. Constable—certainly in my argument touching the identity of the human being—I alluded only to the latter theory. Mr. Wilson's counter-argument from unconsciousness in sleep not destroying identity in this life which might have been good enough had I been arguing, as he says, against the denial of "a continuous *conscious* existence," has no force, therefore, to overthrow my argument against "the nonentity of the dead."

I am compelled by what seems to me very plain passages of Scripture to believe in the conscious and happy existence of departed saints with Christ in Paradise before their "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul," in the resurrection. I am very glad to believe that blessed truth. But I should have no great objection, if Scripture allowed me, to believe in a state of unconsciousness for all between death and resurrection. Certainly I never could have used the "identity" argument against it. Yours faithfully,

W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas' Parsonage,
Douglas.

CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

SIR,—Mr. Ridley's letter in regard to the word "Conditional" as in connection with "Immortality," may be answered without the expression of any desire on my part for the retention of that epithet.

It is not, I think, the intention of those who have married those two words together, to state that the condition on which immortality is attained is moral fitness, but faith.

Faith, however, cannot Scripturally be called a condition, since itself is the gift of God. Faith is not an independent effort of the human will; the record that God has given of his Son is not credible by the natural man (1 Cor. ii. 14); that which is "*dead* in trespasses and sins" cannot arouse *itself* to spiritual life. Salvation, consequently, is said to be "*by grace through faith*, and that *not of yourselves*, but the gift of God" (Ephes. ii. 8); i.e., faith divinely bestowed by grace unto salvation. Repentance being the condition. (Mark i. 4; Acts iii. 19; xi. 18.)

The Apostle asks, "What have we that we have not received?" (1 Cor. iv. 7.) A question replied to by the Lord Jesus himself when he expressly referred saving faith to the immediate gift of God. (John vi. 65.) See also Phil. i. 29.

Upon the above grounds it is desirable that the word "conditional" be discontinued; the term to be substituted having reference to the occasion of its requirement.

I am, faithfully yours,

H. GOODWYN.

Wellington House, Clevedon.

Digitized by Google

Literature.

The Coming of the Antichrist. London: Partridge & Co.

In every way a remarkable pamphlet. The character and intelligence of the author—a respectable medical man—precludes the thought that it is a contribution to "sensationalism." Yet when the theory of the book is that Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the late Emperor of the French, is not dead,—or at any rate that the proof of his death is not sufficient,—but that a great fraud has been perpetrated upon the world in relation to his reported demise at Chiselhurst, what shall we say? We have carefully read, with a kind of fascinated interest, the arguments by which it is sought to establish this startling hypothesis; but, of course, we are not in a position either to affirm or deny its truth. *If* it be true, the re-appearance of the ex-Emperor some day on the stage of European politics will amaze mankind. All "the world will wonder"—and no wonder!

The Biblical Museum. By James Comper Gray. Old Testament, vol. ii., containing Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. London: Elliot Stock.

Mr. Gray continues his labours with praiseworthy perseverance. The sub-title of his work—which explains its object—is: "A Collection of Notes explanatory, homiletic, and illustrative of the Holy Scriptures, especially designed for the use of ministers, Bible-students, and Sunday-school teachers." We have more than once spoken approvingly of this work, and we repeat the commendation. No one can complain of waste-paper here. Even the margins are crowded with quotations, in small type, from ancient and modern authors—quotations which happily illustrate both text and commentary. For teachers who require such help, the "Biblical Museum" is a rare treasure.

The Wilmots: A South Australian Story. By Effie Stanley. London: Elliot Stock.

The interest of this book is chiefly domestic, with a bit of romance respecting a certain shepherd who turns out to be—well, you must ask Miss Stanley. We have no hesitation in accepting even this as a fact; for our colonial empire affords boundless facilities for the enterprise of young Englishmen, whether patristic or plebeian. There is neither affectation of fine writing, nor over done description of scenery here, but a plain and natural style which sensible people like.

The Preachers' Analyst. London: Stock.

This "monthly homiletical magazine" contains, as it professes, much in little, brief essays, extracts, hints on sermon-making, and so forth, with references to works on the subjects noted.

Inspired Ethics: being a revised translation and topical arrangement of the entire Book of Proverbs. By John Stock, LL.D., Huddersfield. London: Elliot Stock.

The revision departs from the A.V. only when the translator considered it absolutely necessary. The peculiarity of the book is its topical arrangement into groups. The "wise sayings of the Book classified" thus will no doubt be helpful to some teachers.

The Bread of God: As foreshadowed in the Old Testament and fulfilled in Christ. By F. M. Fearnley. London: S. Bagster and Sons.

Digitized by Google

A VERY interesting and instructive little work, in which the devout and learned author gives the result of his examination of the entire Bible on the subject of bread. The incidental remarks and foot notes are also valuable.

Man's Claim to Immortality. By Arthur Hayne Hamilton, Rector of St. Mary Arches, Exeter.

The Eternities of Scripture. By Theologus. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

THESE pamphlets are by the same author, and for learning and logic they do him honour. His argument is clearly stated. Immortality is not the "*property* of man;" and the "eternities of Scripture" do not mean endlessness, as the words in themselves are indefinite and variable. We are glad to have such an able ally as Mr. Hamilton. He has one or two positions, respecting judgment and the sufferings of the wicked, which we cannot endorse.

NOTICES.

THE Volume of the RAINBOW for 1877, cloth, lettered, is now ready, price 7s. 6d. The quantity of profitable reading in this handsome book is very large. We respectfully hint that to those who can appreciate its value, it is a good Christmas or New Year's present. Cases for binding the numbers for the year may also be had of the publisher, price 1s. each.

"A. W. W."—If there is no local bookseller through whom the RAINBOW can be obtained, send a money order for 6s., payable to the publisher at the Chief Office, St. Martin's le Grand, and you will receive it by post on the first of every month next year.

"S. T."—It is matter for much thankfulness to us to find that this journal is increasingly prized by men who reverence the Holy Scriptures. The approval of men who deny the authority of the Bible we should be sorry to have; but when we hear, as we did the other day, of a sceptic turned from unbelief to faith through the instrumentality of one of our papers, we "thank God and take courage."

"A MINISTER" takes a cheerful view of things, and hopes that the Gospel will soon convert the world, "because the leaven is working!" Alas! it *is* working, fearfully, fatally. It has long ago "leavened the whole," with its grievous corruptions. Our correspondent uses "leaven" in a good sense. This did not our MASTER. Leaven is sour dough. Leaven causes to ferment and turn sour. It is therefore used in the sense of corruption. *We* also "take a cheerful view of things," but it is because Christ is coming, and *only* for that reason.

A CLERGYMAN writes: "I have read with much pleasure your pamphlet, 'The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life.' I think your citations of Scripture are excellent, and I have specially marked your last paragraph. Your view of the parabolic value of the narrative of 'The Rich Man and Lazarus' is new and interesting, and agrees well with the context."

"J. L." (Toronto), says, "I see from the proceedings of a Methodist Conference at Bristol, England, that several young men training for the

Digitized by Google

ministry in that church had tendered their resignation, which was accepted, rather than hold and teach '*the fierce falsehood*,' as you truly term it, of '*eternal torments*,'—the perpetuity of sin and suffering for ever. This is a most hopeful and interesting incident, for they will in all probability become missionaries of the truth. The friends of truth have much reason to thank our heavenly Father, and take courage to move on towards the goal which we hope through grace ultimately to reach.' The Lord bless you in your self-denying labours in his service."

A GENTLEMAN in Australia writes: "I value the RAINBOW next to the Holy Scriptures. Our brethren here who, with myself, have been led to rejoice in the blessed hope to be realised at the return of our Lord —also in the final extinction of the wicked—desire to express our gratitude to our heavenly Father for sparing you yet to fill the important position to which he has called you, and pray that abundant blessing may crown your labours."

"N."—Your letter is in the waste basket, because sarcasm against a writer who is honestly dealing with a great subject does not commend itself to our taste. Should you think fit to change your tone, you may get a hearing.

EL. K.—The last verse of Heb. xii., so far from "exciting terror," is a blessed condensation of good news. God will consume all sin out of his people, and all sinners out of his world.

"P. R."—The word of God has *no* propositions which are contrary to reason, and to suppose such for the purpose of showing the cleverness of the "verifying faculty" is absurd. You must not put in Scripture what is not there for the purpose of showing that it could not be there.

"S. J. T." favours us with the following "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:"

1. What does Jesus say he is to his disciples?
2. What does Jesus say to Peter?
3. What does Solomon say is in every place?
4. What does the Lord say the angels are to be?
5. What does Moses promise Israel?
6. What does the Lord say to the leprous man?
7. Who does John say man hath not seen?
8. What does Paul say to the jailor?
9. What does David ask God to do for him?
10. What does Jesus tell the woman of Samaria he can give?

The initials give the title of this Magazine.

1. T he light of the world. (John viii. 12.)
2. H ave faith in God. (Mark xi. 22.)
3. E yes of the Lord. (Prov. xv. 3.)
4. R eapers. (Matt. xiii. 29.)
5. A blessing if ye obey the commandments of the Lord. (Deut. xi. 27.)
6. I will, be thou clean. (Matt. viii. 3.)
7. N o man hath seen God. (John i. 18.)
8. B elieve in the Lord Jesus Christ. (Acts xvi. 31.)
9. O, visit me with thy salvation. (Psa. cvi. 4.)
10. W ell of water springing up into everlasting life. (John iv. 14.)

Chaloner & Cooke, Printers, Oxford Arms Passage, Warwick Lane, E.C.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google